

COURSE GUIDEBOOK



Ideas in Politics

Part II

- Lecture 13: Socialism—Problems & Objections
- Lecture 14: Ecological Ideas, Part I
- Lecture 15: Ecological Ideas, Part II
- Lecture 16: Feminism
- Lecture 17: Problems of Liberal Feminism
- Lecture 18: Feminism Concluded
- Lecture 19: Nationalism
- Lecture 20: Multiculturalism
- Lecture 21: Gay & Lesbian Politics
- Lecture 22: Religion & Politics in the West
- Lecture 23: Toleration, Censorship & Pornography
- Lecture 24: The End of History

1-800-TEACH-12

1-800-832-2412

THE TEACHING COMPANY®

4151 Lafayette Center Drive, Suite 100

Chantilly, VA 20151-1232

www.teach12.com

Course No.

486

Ideas in Politics, Part II
Professor Jeremy Shearmur

COURSE GUIDEBOOK



THE Great Courses®

Teaching that engages the mind™

Ideas in Politics

Part II

Professor Jeremy Shearmur
Australian National University



THE TEACHING COMPANY®

Jeremy Shearmur, Ph.D.

Reader in Philosophy, Australian National University

Jeremy Shearmur was educated at the London School of Economics (University of London), where he also worked for eight years as assistant to Professor Sir Karl Popper. He subsequently taught philosophy at the University of Edinburgh and political theory at the University of Manchester; he also served as Director of Studies of the Center for Policy Studies, a public policy think tank founded by, among others, Maggie Thatcher. He then worked as a research associate professor for the Institute for Humane Studies at George Mason University, also teaching for the Department of Philosophy there. Professor Shearmur is currently a Reader in Philosophy in the Faculty of Arts at the Australian National University. His appointment is in the Department of Political Science, but he has also taught for the Department of Philosophy. He has a reputation as an enthusiastic and popular lecturer; his experience ranges from large first-year classes on political thought and the history of philosophy to lectures on political ideologies for senior military officers from Australia and overseas at the Australian College for Defense and Strategic Studies.

Professor Shearmur's Ph.D. thesis, on F. A. Hayek, was a joint winner of the British Political Studies Association's Sir Ernest Barker prize in political theory. He has published *The Political Thought of Karl Popper and Hayek and After* (both Routledge, 1996) and was joint editor of H. B. Acton's *The Morals of Markets and Related Essays* (Liberty Fund, 1993). He was the editor of a special issue of the *Marquette Law Review*, which consisted of the proceedings of a conference on issues raised by privatization, and joint editor of a special issue of *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* on the political thought of Karl Popper. He has also published numerous papers in philosophy and political thought. Professor Shearmur is finishing the manuscript of a book entitled *Living with Markets*, which discusses, *inter alia*, blood, autonomy, pornography, and the social constitution of the public sphere and offers a positive appraisal of the possibilities of human flourishing in a market-based society.

Future research plans include a commissioned volume on Hayek's political thought, a study of knowledge and institutions that links issues in philosophy to the contemporary theme of "knowledge management," and a history of debates about the blood supply, considered as a case study in applied philosophy.

Professor Shearmur particularly enjoys work in archives, and his labors there have informed his books and led him to several smaller papers and research notes.

Table of Contents

Ideas in Politics

Part II

Professor Biography.....	1
Course Scope.....	1
Lecture Thirteen Socialism—Problems and Objections.....	8
Lecture Fourteen Ecological Ideas, Part I.....	7
Lecture Fifteen Ecological Ideas, Part II.....	10
Lecture Sixteen Feminism.....	13
Lecture Seventeen Problems of Liberal Feminism.....	16
Lecture Eighteen Feminism Concluded.....	20
Lecture Nineteen Nationalism.....	24
Lecture Twenty Multiculturalism.....	29
Lecture Twenty-One Gay and Lesbian Politics.....	34
Lecture Twenty-Two Religion and Politics in the West.....	38
Lecture Twenty-Three Toleration, Censorship, and Pornography.....	43
Lecture Twenty-Four The End of History.....	46
Timeline.....	50
Glossary.....	55
Biographical Notes.....	60
Bibliography.....	64

Ideas in Politics

Scope:

This course of lectures explores ideas that are at work in Western, especially American, politics today. Current controversies have their roots in different interpretations of the liberal tradition: classical and welfare liberalism, conservatism, and libertarianism. We consider how such ideas might be applied to issues in real life: How do they affect the design of institutions? How do they respond to the question of unemployment?

A striking contemporary discussion has been opened by the Harvard political scientist Robert Putnam. In his *Bowling Alone*, he argues that Americans are increasingly less active in political participation, as well as voluntary groups and associations, and that this situation is likely to have dire consequences for our lives, from health to political processes. We explore the intellectual context of Putnam and look at responses to it from different political positions.

So far we have dealt with the mainstream of politics. We go on to explore a range of ideas that have challenged the mainstream. We start by looking at the influential ideas of Karl Marx and continue with other socialist ideas, which offer a moral critique of our existing society. We then look briefly at some recent academic work that stands between socialism and welfare liberalism. After presenting these ideas in a manner that should give some insight into why people have taken such views, we turn to some criticisms of socialism.

Next, we turn to ecological problems and the idea that they should prompt considerable political and economic changes—extensive regulation, for example, and the international redistribution of resources. With this thought, we contrast ideas that are often known as “free-market environmentalism.” These ideas are concerned with how property rights and tradable permits to pollute can put markets to work to solve environmental problems. We then turn to a different kind of argument—the exploration of ideas about so-called “deep ecology” and the view that ecological systems should be considered valuable in themselves and should impose moral constraints on human action, much as the rights of other people do.

From this material, we turn to feminism. We explore this topic, first, through the work of the nineteenth-century liberal philosopher John Stuart Mill, who examined the social situation of women in his day and gave his ideas for improving it. Those improvements were more or less in place by the early 1960s and can stand as a useful point of comparison with the ideas of the American feminist Betty Friedan. Friedan’s ideas serve as a springboard for looking at problems of liberal feminism and the wider questions it raises for influential, contemporary liberal ideas in general. We then look, briefly, at socialist feminism and radical feminism from the 1970s and at “difference feminism”—at controversies it has raised and its effects on real-world issues, such as legal

arguments. Finally, we examine responses of liberal feminists to criticisms of liberalism by other feminists and analyze conservative responses to feminism.

From feminism, we turn to other political ideas that bring issues of identity into the heart of politics. We look at nationalism, at its character and at the arguments that have taken place about its desirability, or otherwise. We then turn to multiculturalism and, again, get to the root of current controversies by looking at its development and at arguments between its proponents and its critics. This, in turn, leads us to issues relating to homosexuality, not least because multiculturalism has been taken as one model for gay and lesbian politics. We again survey some of the history here and look at a particular line of argument for gay marriage offered by Andrew Sullivan. His argument is distinctive because, in some respects, it is conservative in character. We then consider objections that have been raised against it by some less conservative homosexuals—and the views of those influenced by “queer theory.” We also briefly examine religious objections to homosexuality.

These objections raise vital questions of a more general character, concerning the relationship between religious and secular authority and, more generally, between religion and politics in Western countries. We look at this issue, and that of toleration, in two lectures; in the second lecture, we also consider issues of free expression and pornography. In this way, our argument takes us back to the mainstream of politics and to issues between conservatives and different kinds of liberals.

The course concludes with a challenge: Does not the collapse of the Soviet Union show our discussion to have been somewhat beside the point? There is now, surely, no alternative to liberal democracy. We explore this claim by considering Francis Fukuyama’s argument to this effect, and we consider how people who espouse the different ideas that we have been discussing might respond to it.

Lecture Thirteen

Socialism—Problems and Objections

Scope: We have seen how socialism has presented a moral critique of industrialized societies. In this lecture, we will consider criticisms of socialist thought. People may contest socialism’s moral assumptions, or they may contend that while interesting, socialist arguments are outweighed by issues of greater moral importance. Critics may also argue that socialists’ views about how society should be organized are not effective in achieving their own ideals. Finally, we turn to the current state of socialism and look briefly at the kinds of things that those who see themselves as socialists are typically hoping for today.

Outline

- I. Should we accept the moral case for socialism? Liberals and conservatives would contest arguments for socialism on three grounds.
 - A. They would object to the moral case made for socialism.
 - B. They would contest the cogency of Marxism.
 - C. They would argue that it is not clear how a society anything like ours could put socialist ideals into practice.
- II. Objections to the moral case for socialism can be summed up fairly easily:
 - A. Material equality is at odds with liberty as it is understood by liberals and realized in a market-based economy. Also, a planned economy cannot achieve what a market-based economy can.
 - B. It distinctively threatens freedom by concentrating the control of resources in relatively few hands.
 - C. At a more specifically moral level, two arguments are worth noting:
 1. The production of wealth is the result of the efforts, ideas, plans, and initiatives of particular people—it is not available just to meet the needs of anyone.
 2. “Virtue ethics” can be invoked to make a case for the moral significance of particular personal relationships, and personal moral agendas, that have a legitimate claim on individuals’ resources.
- III. In making a case against Marxism, a critic might respond as follows:
 - A. Marxism has important strengths.
 1. It highlights some real problems about the society we live in.
 2. It shows that problems are often not open to easy solutions.

3. It emphasizes economics as a key to understanding politics and ideas (though critics would typically contend that Marx's analysis is marred by his defective economics).
 4. Its cynical view of politics is sometimes refreshing.
- B.** But Marxism also has devastating weaknesses.
1. The key problem is that behind its cynical and realistic view of our current situation lurks a utopian view of future possibilities.
 2. Marxism has not grasped the significance of Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich Hayek's "Austrian" critique of central economic planning.
 3. This critique posits that markets are essential to large-scale commercial societies. Further, when you have a large-scale market economy, much that occurs no longer falls within the scope of political control, democratic or otherwise.
 4. Market economies have defects, which it may be possible to remedy, to some degree, through political or voluntary action.
 5. But if Mises and Hayek are right, there are limits to what can be accomplished, politically, without harming a market economy.
 6. Marxists would agree, but they write as if all the advantages of a commercial society would still be available if we were to repudiate the mechanisms that make it possible.
- C.** Class conflict is real, but no more fundamental than other kinds of conflict.
1. The view that it is *the* key depends on highly contentious economic theories.
 2. If class conflict in the Marxist sense were removed, other conflicts would come to the fore.
 3. Competition, like the desire for profit, is useful because it spurs us to produce things others will pay for.
 4. Our very powerlessness (for example, in our economic activities) is a consequence of the desirable fact that we are directed, through the price mechanism, to meet the needs of others.
- IV.** Even if the previous criticisms were ineffective, critics would typically argue that the real problem about socialism is that it is not clear how its ideals could be realized.
- A.** Early socialism typically favored various kinds of experimental communes, which were socially marginal.
 - B.** Another early ideal, producer cooperatives, usually seem uncompetitive under capitalism.
 - C.** Revolutionary socialism (e.g., Marxism) exhibits a tension between what is needed for revolutionary organization and its espousal of democracy.

- 1.** We may well lose existing checks on the abuse of power in the course of revolutionary change. What is supposed to follow the revolution in respect to politics and economics? How do you combine democracy, economic planning, and an effective economy?
 - 2.** Although we can grant to the Marxist that the USSR was not what Marx intended, that country's difficulties do, surely, serve as a model of some of the problems.
- D.** Trade unionism may produce gains for its members, but again, some questions arise.
- 1.** Can these gains be extended to all workers (or are they not, typically, at the expense of the less-organized parts of the labor force)?
 - 2.** Do markets set limits to what can be achieved?
 - 3.** Does their activity lead to fundamental change of a kind that socialists can welcome?
 - 4.** How do they function in a global economy?
- E.** Nationalization was at one time seen as a practical realization of socialist ideas about common ownership. But it ran into problems of:
- 1.** Efficiency;
 - 2.** The political manipulation of investments (that is, their use as political spoils or inducements, rather than their use in line with socialist values);
 - 3.** An unclear relationship between nationalization and participation and other socialist values.
- F.** Libertarian socialism strongly emphasizes freedom: The state is seen as oppressive and in the hands of big business. This approach raises interesting critical insights, but what is to be done is, again, not quite so clear.
- G.** Market socialism argues for the use of the price system without capitalism, suggesting that this will allow for decentralized decision making. This form of socialism has been criticized from the right (about its feasibility) and the left (because of its reliance on self-interest).

Essential Reading:

Steele, David Ramsay. *From Marx to Mises*. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1992. A striking presentation of the "Austrian" critique of socialism.

Supplementary Reading:

Hayek, Friedrich A. *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944. A "classic" exposition of the case against central economic planning.

Le Grand, Julian, and Estrin, Paul, eds. *Market Socialism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. An interesting collection by writers who argue for the possibility of combining socialist ideals and the price system.

de Jasay, Anthony. *Market Socialism: A Scrutiny, "This Square Circle."* London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1990. A brief but hard-hitting critical engagement with ideas about the feasibility of market socialism.

Roemer, John E. *A Future for Socialism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994. A lively defense of socialism as feasible by a leading American socialist economist.

Questions to Consider:

1. Is socialism an attractive but impracticable ideal?
2. Can the critics of socialism answer its moral critique of our society?

Lecture Fourteen

Ecological Ideas, Part I

Scope: Ecological problems have been used as the basis on which to mount an argument for extensive governmental intervention. People have argued for not just national but also international regulation and redistribution, and they have developed their case through a mixture of analysis and moral argument. A counterargument has been developed by the proponents of markets who claim that ecological problems typically involve "the tragedy of the commons." They advocate privatization. The idea of "tradable rights to pollute" has been introduced as a further way to enable market mechanisms to work toward a solution.

Outline

- I. Ecological arguments are often made against classical liberalism.
 - A. Ecological problems show up market failures. These include:
 1. "Externalities"—overspill effects, such as pollution;
 2. Problems of public goods: because non-payers cannot be excluded from benefits, people are reluctant to pay (e.g., for clean air);
 3. Ignorance: we do not always know the consequences of actions that can, in a market economy, have undesired effects;
 4. Ecology and Adam Smith's ideas about unplanned coordination: ecological systems may be seen as unplanned orders, that are upset by human economic activity. (This is analogous to the idea that political intervention upsets the coordination of economic systems.)
 - B. Distributional issues include the following ideas:
 1. Early developers gain an unfair advantage because the environment can soak up only so many byproducts of human action without damage.
 2. The rich use up too many resources.
 3. The problems caused by development are dumped on the poor.
 4. Thus, ecological arguments conclude that we need international government intervention to ensure sustainable growth and equity.
- II. In their defense, some classical liberals have argued that the ideas from their tradition are needed to handle ecological problems.
 - A. Some claim that behind ecological problems stands what Garrett Hardin has called "the tragedy of the commons." This involves:
 1. Common ownership of some resource;
 2. All users suffering from its over-use;
 3. The fact that it is to the advantage of each participant to use the resource as much as they can.

- B. Classical liberals would say that privatization is the answer because:
 - 1. Owners have an incentive to conserve their resources;
 - 2. Private ownership allocates rights over land use;
 - 3. Private ownership allocates liability for overspill effects.
- C. Classical liberals also often argue that one cannot assume that government will sort these things out.
 - 1. Some governments have a very bad track record, such as those in Eastern Europe and the United States.
 - 2. Governments do not simply act in the public interest; rather, they respond to lobbying. This has led to systems that create ecological and economic disasters (e.g., water and timber).
 - 3. Regulation imposes the tastes of the rich and powerful.
- D. Government can do as follows: (The more libertarian classical liberals are less keen on this, because of the role it gives to government.)
 - 1. Substitute private property rights for “commons”;
 - 2. Create marketable “rights to pollute”;
 - 3. Ensure that such rights diminish over time: new users must purchase rights, giving users incentives to reduce pollution;
 - 4. Offer ecological groups the opportunity to purchase and destroy rights to pollute.

Essential Reading:

Dobson, Andrew. *Green Political Thought*, third edition. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. The latest edition of a guide to political environmentalism by a widely published author on these issues.

Supplementary Reading:

Anderson, Terry, and Leal, Donald. *Free Market Environmentalism Today*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. A new book by two well-known proponents of these ideas.

Eckersley, Robyn. *Environmentalism and Political Theory*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. An interesting—but not an easy—work on environmental political theory, written from the left of the political spectrum.

Eckersley, Robyn, ed. *Markets, the State and the Environment: Towards Integration*. South Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia, 1995. This collection shows a group of writers with environmental concerns who are not familiar with, and are, for the most part, critical of, free market environmentalist perspectives.

Questions to Consider:

- 1. Do ecological problems really force issues about the redistribution of resources onto the wealthy?
- 2. What are the pros and cons of “licenses to pollute”?

Lecture Fifteen

Ecological Ideas, Part II

Scope: Some environmentalists feel that the whole ecological debate is missing the point. They argue that we should distinguish between “shallow” and “deep” ecology. Shallow ecology pursues ecological issues from the perspective of human beings. Deep ecology takes environmental systems as significant in themselves. The Australian philosopher Peter Singer claimed that we usually exhibit an unjustified preference for members of our own species. Singer argued that our sphere of concern should be widened to encompass all sentient beings. Some proponents of ecological ideas have argued that we should widen the circle to put other species *and* ecological systems on a par with ourselves.

Outline

- I. To the free market environmentalist’s arguments, which we considered at the end of the previous lecture, the proponent of regulation might respond:
 - A. Measures involving resources, private property rights, and pricing of pollution do not properly handle distributional issues.
 - B. Some free-market environmentalist claims are far-fetched if offered as a complete solution to environmental problems.
 1. In some cases, capital value is no check on the destruction of resources; it may actually pay us to behave in this way.
 2. Some resources (e.g., air, the high seas, ozone) do not seem amenable to property rights or similar approaches.
 - C. Government sometimes has a good track record on environmental issues, depending on its responsiveness to democratic pressures. But checks and balances—as in the United States—may make one government ineffectual, as compared to, say, Swedish or West German practices.
 - D. We also need to distinguish between overspill effects, where market-based approaches may be useful, and problems that involve entire ecological systems.
- II. An ecologist might protest that such exchanges ignore the key issues.
 - A. Both approaches share an unsustainable “growth” paradigm.
 - B. The whole discussion has disregarded a key issue about values.
 - C. We must adopt a new view of politics and of mankind’s place in the world—new values.

III. Values: what counts?

- A. Some people have argued that the best way for some animal species to thrive is to be either pets or food for humans.
- B. Does the argument work for people? We would respond: no, people must not be treated in that way. They have rights.
- C. But who—or what—has rights?
- D. Some possible answers are:
 1. People alive now have rights;
 2. Future generations, too;
 3. Animals have rights. Peter Singer, in *Animal Liberation*, argues against “speciesism” (drawing a parallel with racism): exhibiting an unjustifiable bias toward our own species. He thinks all sentient animals deserve moral consideration.

IV. In 1973, the Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess introduced an important distinction between “shallow ecology”—a concern for ecology in relation to human life—and “deep ecology”—a wider concern for ecological systems.

- A. The crucial difference is between a view that places us and our interests at the center of everything and a view in which our ecological environment counts as if it had rights of its own.
- B. Note also the Gaia hypothesis introduced by James Lovelock in 1979. Gaia was the name he gave to a complex entity involving the biosphere as a feedback system.
- C. This theory was partly offered as a scientific hypothesis and partly as quasi-religious ideas about an earth goddess.
- D. Such ideas have, in turn, led some to offer a plea that we should take a new view of our world or adopt new values; we should shift the focus of the view of ourselves and our interests from our individuality to something more holistic in character.
- E. Links have been made between these ecological ideas and mystical religious ideas.
- F. Some writers have offered speculative interpretations of recent developments in science that they claim fit these ideas.
- G. In more practical terms, such an approach has led to a range of political actions, from the adoption of peaceful, hippy-minimalist lifestyles to ecological terrorism, including the “spiking” of logging timber.
- H. The consequences of these ideas are:
 1. If taken seriously, deep ecology poses problems for the extended market order favored by liberals and extended political processes of the kind that we are used to in the United States and other Western countries.

2. Those who favor these ideas are attracted to small-scale societies where people know better what they are doing and live a much simpler lifestyle with little adverse environmental impact.
3. They are also likely to argue that we need supernational organizations that will regulate what we all do to protect the environment from our actions.
4. A major problem exists, though, with these consequences. Such societies can support far fewer people than live today and at nothing like existing living standards of developed countries. If we favor such ideas, we would also have to consider just what they would mean in practical terms (e.g., in terms of redistribution and the limitation of population growth).

Essential Reading:

Devall, Bill, and Sessions, George. *Deep Ecology*. Salt Lake City, UT: G.M. Smith, 1985. An influential "classic" on deep ecology.

Supplementary Reading:

Naess, Arne. *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Statement of Naess's approach to ecological issues by originator of the term "deep ecology."

Sessions, George, ed. *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, 1994. Collection of essays explaining the "deep ecology" perspective.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*, revised edition. Avon/Hearst Corporation, 1991. This work combines utilitarian philosophy and details of how animals are treated to present a case that animals should be treated very differently and to argue in favor of vegetarianism.

Zimmerman, Michael E., ed. *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*. Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997. This useful anthology contains contributions that discuss a whole range of approaches to environmental issues.

Questions to Consider:

1. Do animals—or ecological systems—require moral consideration in their own right?
2. Should we be willing to make significant changes to our style of life on ecological grounds?

Lecture Sixteen

Feminism

Scope: One powerful challenge to the mainstream ideas we have been discussing has come from feminism. An early work in liberal feminism is John Stuart Mill's *On the Subjection of Women* (1869). For Mill, the situation of women in his society was unsatisfactory. This was true both for women themselves and because of the effects of women's subservient position on personal relationships and society. We examine Mill's defense of his views and what he expected to occur if his ideas were accepted. Then we jump to the early 1960s to discuss the ideas of Betty Friedan, a more recent liberal feminist and a founder of the National Organization of Women. When Friedan wrote her *Feminine Mystique* (1963), most of what Mill wanted had been achieved.

Outline

- I. Feminism includes both analysis of the subordinate position of women and the political struggle against it.
 - A. Its (discontinuous) history starts from Christine de Pisan (1364–1430).
 - B. Aside from its prime concerns, it has led to powerful and challenging ideas in both politics and political thought.
 - C. Our concern is with how feminism relates to ideas discussed so far.
 - D. We start by looking at liberalism and feminism, through some of John Stuart Mill's work. Although other interesting feminist writers, who were women, came before Mill—for example, Mary Wollstonecraft, author of *Vindication of the Rights of Women*—Mill's particular discussion will enable us to see certain key features of liberal feminism.
- II. John Stuart Mill's (1806–1873) best-known work in this field, *On the Subjection of Women*, was written in 1861 and published in 1869. It was one of the areas where his wife's influence was significant.
 - A. The work is important because Mill was a major theorist of liberalism.
 - B. In Mill's day, a married couple was treated as one person under the law.
 1. A wife typically had no independent property rights.
 2. Legal separation was difficult and costly.
 3. Women did not have the vote.
 4. Women were denied entry into higher education and many careers.
 - C. Mill's noted parallels with contemporary arguments against slavery.
 1. As a consequence of legal arrangements, men exercised power in the family.
 2. Power brings out the worst in people.

3. Women's characters and the quality of relationships are affected.
 4. Men are damaged by having an undeserved superiority.
 5. Women sacrifice themselves for the sake of others, then impose conventional opinions on men.
 6. One might sum this up by saying: the situation of women is at odds with liberalism, in itself and in its social effects.
- D. Possible objections to Mill's view, and Mill's responses, include:
1. "Women are fitted by nature for their existing roles." In Mill's view, women's true nature is not known, but we do know the results of education for servility.
 2. "Women are happy with things the way they are—and that is what my wife confirms when I ask her." For Mill, women's true feelings are also not known. For example, how can a master be sure that his servant will be candid about what he thinks of him as a master?
 3. "Formal legal arrangements, and the differences between the status of men and of women, are not a good guide to actual relations—things are not as bad for women as they might seem!" For Mill, this argument is like paternalistic defenses of slavery.
- E. What did Mill want?
1. Legal equality and property rights for women;
 2. The availability of legal separation;
 3. No bars to women in the job market;
 4. Educational equality;
 5. That women should have the vote.
- F. Mill also believed that the then-traditional division of labor (as far, it might be said, as concerned middle-class women) would remain.
1. He believed the opportunity for (some) women to earn was enough.
 2. If women were to work, they would seldom get relief from their family duties. (Was this conservatism or realism on Mill's part?)
- G. Mill advanced these arguments, and changes took place, but only after feminists fought hard for the vote and for wider social change.
- H. What was the result when what Mill wanted had been achieved?
- I. To judge this, we can usefully jump to the early 1960s and to a book written in the United States.
- III. Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963) is noteworthy in itself and for its impact on Friedan's role in co-founding the National Organization of Women. It is also an interesting example of a liberal feminist writing when, in formal terms, Mill's requirements about institutions had been largely met.
- A. Friedan did not discuss Mill, but she was writing at a time when much of the institutional change that Mill favored had taken place. She argued that the situation of women was still unsatisfactory.
1. Suburban motherhood was wrongly promoted as satisfying.

2. Women blamed themselves for this situation.
 3. Psychological research had suggested that a career was the key to a satisfying life.
 4. In Friedan's view, a career should not come at the expense of motherhood and a traditional family if women want that.
- B. What should be done? Friedan argued that:
1. We need to change the domestic division of labor (the responsibilities of men and women).
 2. Formal and informal obstacles to women's careers should be removed.
 3. Government spending on women's education should be increased.
- C. Friedan's work, and the response to it, was important in shaping feminism as we know it today.
- D. Certain of the criticisms that Friedan made, and that were subsequently pursued by other feminist writers, challenge our usual expectations concerning politics and society, as we see in the next lecture.

Essential Reading:

Mill, John Stuart. *The Subjection of Women*. Mill's essay is readable and available in many editions; for example, it is included in *On Liberty and Other Essays*, ed. John Gray, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Supplementary Reading:

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* [1792]. This powerful early feminist work is available in many editions; for example, *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, ed. Ashley Tauchert, London: Everyman Paperbacks, 1995.

Bryson, Valerie. *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction*. New York: Paragon House, 1992. A readable and wide-ranging guide to feminist political thought.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Dell, 1984. Betty Friedan's work is still both provocative and interesting and continues to sell very well.

de Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex* [1949]. New York: Vintage, 1989. This was a path-breaking work, which combined feminist analysis and philosophical reflection, by a distinguished French philosopher.

Questions to Consider:

1. Just how important a role do institutional and legal arrangements play in terms of the character of personal relationships?
2. What kinds of social arrangements are needed if women are to be able to combine a family and the successful pursuit of a career?

Lecture Seventeen

Problems of Liberal Feminism

Scope: Issues raised in connection with feminism are of importance for women and their concerns. But they also call into question many of the assumptions that liberals make about politics and society more generally. We discuss this and look briefly at some strands in socialist feminism and at an example of the "radical feminism" that was developed in the early 1970s. We consider Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics* and some of the ideas that her work made known, such as the distinction between sex and gender. We also look, briefly, at some of the other ideas associated with this period in feminist thought, such as the feminist critique of pornography.

Outline

- I. Friedan's work spurred a number of developments.
 - A. Some women pursued a wider agenda that combined feminism and welfare liberalism, including demands for daycare, better health provision for women, and affirmative action in employment.
 - B. Groups of women met together, away from men, to discuss problems and issues relating to women and their attitudes toward them. Feminism developed into what some call a new social movement.
 - C. These developments, in turn, led to academic work, which posed problems for liberal feminism and raised some interesting questions for liberalism in its various forms.
- II. What are the problems of liberal feminism and problems for liberalism?
 - A. Consider the ideal of self-realization by way of a career and family responsibilities, along with the domestic division of labor and childcare.
 - B. Both issues are:
 1. in the private realm; that is they are issues that, under liberalism, are largely for people to sort out informally;
 2. affected, under liberalism, by the private resources that people can command;
 3. affected by existing conventions in the public realm, which historically, were largely made by and for men.
 - C. As a result, individual self-realization for women might seem to require:
 1. access to resources that individuals and families may not necessarily possess privately;
 2. a large-scale reshaping of social conventions.
 - D. We might argue that the liberal ideal of self-realization is in tension with the social and economic arrangements that liberals favor.

- E. Two issues arise from this:
 1. The idea that other people have a responsibility for assisting you to achieve self-development is one of the points at issue between classical and welfare liberalism. Welfare liberals will be open to arguments about the need for tax-funded childcare and so on.
 2. Once some convention is in place that may disadvantage women, it may be difficult to shift it, especially in cases where we need a new shared convention. No one may "own" the convention (in the way, say, that the government owns the rule of the road). Feminists may have raised a really interesting problem, here, but one we may not know how to solve.
- F. More radically, do liberal ideals themselves perhaps stand in need of revision? Do women, for liberals, end up as something like defective men? Do they become individuals whom nature and society have formed in ways that make it difficult for them to realize liberal ideals? If this is so, may the fault not be with the ideals?

- III. Early socialism included nontraditional ideas (and sometimes practices) about family life and social roles.
 - A. Some classic Marxist writers, such as Friedrich Engels and August Bebel, discussed feminist issues.
 - B. Their economics-based perspective highlighted some thought-provoking issues about the relationship between men and women and wider patterns of economic activity.
 1. They saw class, not sexual divisions, as fundamental to social analysis.
 2. They saw socialism as offering the resolution of women's problems, according to which women should work with men to achieve socialism, rather than having a cause of their own.
 - C. More recent socialist feminism:
 1. Offers more detailed theoretical analysis of women's role in the economy (e.g., about part-time and home-based work);
 2. Extends Marxist and other socialist thought to address recent feminist concerns (e.g., Juliet Mitchell's *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*);
 3. Criticizes radical feminism for its opposition to socialist analysis and values.

IV. But what is radical feminism?

- A. In many cases, it was a product of adverse experience by women in the 1960s, of sexual liberation, the "underground," and the left's treatment of women.

- B. Of the many important writers active in this period, Kate Millett published a much-discussed book, *Sexual Politics*, in 1970. Themes to be found in it, and that were also more generally influential, include:
 - 1. Sexual politics: the idea that the relation of men and women is structured by power;
 - 2. Patriarchy: all societies, so far, are patriarchal.
 - 3. Sex and gender are distinguished: masculine and feminine status, role, and temperament are, Millett argued, largely cultural (gender) not biological (sex).
- C. This period also saw an extensive debate around the pros and cons of Freudian analysis in relation to feminist concerns.
- D. A theoretical interest in lesbianism arose as offering models of relationships that were free of male domination.
- E. A critique of pornography and an analysis of rape as an exercise of male power also came to the fore. Andrea Dworkin and Catharine MacKinnon have been influential in this context.

Essential Reading:

Millett, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000. Millett's book is still an interesting read; it contains much more, including literature-based discussion, than the brief presentation here could highlight.

Supplementary Reading:

Mitchell, Juliet. *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*. New York: Pantheon, 1974. An interesting exploration of whether Freudian ideas can be used in tandem with Marxism to address feminist concerns.

Dworkin, Andrea. *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*. New York: Dutton, 1989. A scathing criticism of pornography as depicting the abuse of women. Because Dworkin quotes and describes some gruesome material in graphic terms, this selection will not be for every reader.

Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974. Provocative study of rape as an exercise of male power over women.

Leibowitz, Stan J., and Margolis, Stephen E. *Winners, Losers and Microsoft*. Oakland: The Independent Institute, 1999. This book isn't about feminism, but it does contain some interesting and provocative ideas about conventions and skeptical analysis of claims that we face insuperable problems in changing them. (Compare their discussion of the QWERTY keyboard.)

Questions to Consider:

- 1. When we talk about "the individual," to what extent do we unconsciously assume that we are talking about men?
- 2. Are there effective ways to change informal, shared social conventions?

Lecture Eighteen

Feminism Concluded

Scope: "Difference feminism" is a challenging and controversial movement within feminism. Both liberal and radical feminists have criticized certain characteristics that are usually seen as typically feminine. Difference feminists take issue with the view that women should adopt what they see as masculine or masculine-derived ideals. Here, the work of psychologist Carol Gilligan has been influential. (Her ideas, and related ideas, were used in a court case involving Sears Roebuck.) We also discuss liberal responses to feminist criticisms of liberalism and some conservative responses to feminism, among them the argument that feminism has closed off options that many women find attractive, pressing on them, instead, some of the less desirable features of men's conduct.

Outline

- I. Some strands of liberal and radical feminism are critical of feminine characteristics as they currently exist.
 - A. A tradition of feminist esteem also exists, however, for what is distinctive to women; this tradition was developed in connection with pacifism, the temperance movement, and so on.
 - B. This same tradition has more recently been developed with a stress on its cultural character, as opposed to the idea that it is biologically essential to women. It is often referred to as "difference feminism."
 - C. Liberal, socialist, and radical feminists sometimes expressed concern that what was praised was the product of (or formed a basis for) the domination of women by men.
- II. A much-discussed example of difference feminism is the work of Carol Gilligan (*In a Different Voice*, 1982).
 - A. Gilligan argued that people have two different moral voices:
 1. One involves justice, rights, and abstractions.
 2. The other centers on caring, responsibility, and concrete relationships.
 - B. Gilligan claimed that the second was often used by women.
 - C. Her thesis was vulgarized by others into a simple men/women contrast.
 - D. Discussion around it has given rise to a complex literature.
 - E. An interesting twist was the Sears case:

1. The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission took Sears to court, alleging discrimination against female employees, few of whom figured in high-paid, commission-only sales jobs.
2. Sears called a woman historian to give evidence, who (referring, *inter alia*, to Gilligan) claimed that men and women had different values regarding employment. Sears was not discriminating against women but respecting their preferences.

- III. Modern liberal and radical feminism has been criticized as concerned largely with the interests of white middle-class women in Western countries.
- IV. Recent theoretical work has been concerned with the way in which women and issues of interest to women have been marginalized in academic work.
- V. Feminist ideas, as we have looked at them, pose three main challenges to what was, hitherto, the mainstream of political ideas in the United States.
 - A. One strand in feminism might be seen as the development of a strong form of welfare liberalism focused on the interests of women.
 1. Women are seen as a disadvantaged group who need active government assistance to promote their autonomy and equal opportunities.
 2. There is room for argument about the extent to which welfare liberalism can accommodate feminist concerns.
 - B. Some elements of feminism challenge liberal ideas theoretically, such as we considered when discussing the problems of liberal feminism. To these may be added an emphasis on differences between men and women, opposition to pornography, and an emphasis on, say, codes to regulate conduct between the sexes in universities and colleges.
 - C. Third, some aspects of feminism challenge more traditional views of women's roles and ideals. Such ideas are essential to a life centered on marriage and children and of traditional conceptions of femininity.
- VI. To these challenges, we see an interesting fourfold reaction.
 - A. Classical liberals are concerned about the first two strands of criticism.
 1. Personally, they may not sympathize with older concepts of women's character and roles, but they argue that women should be free to choose their lifestyles, uncoerced by government.
 2. They stress, with J. S. Mill, that legal barriers to women's activities should be removed.
 3. They typically take the view that the kinds of measures proposed by some feminists are paternalistic.
 4. More generally, they are skeptical about the results of governmental action, noting that in the past, regulation for the welfare of women was used as a way to stop women from competing against men.

5. They also object to affirmative action. The women who gain most from it are typically those who are least in need of assistance. The men most likely to lose out are likely to be among the most vulnerable. Affirmative action may devalue people's achievements: Did they succeed on their own merits or only because they were assisted?

B. Conservatives react rather differently.

1. In their view, feminism amounts to the social imposition of a particular, and pernicious, liberal ideal of life for women that is drawn from some of the less attractive features of men's lives.
2. It is hostile toward families and motherhood.
3. It encourages selfishness.
4. Some conservatives object on religious grounds to the kind of conduct and view of life that feminism commends.
5. But conservatives side with feminists in their criticism of pornography, advocacy of practical measures in the interests of women with children, and with some difference-feminist issues.

C. We also find conservative feminists.

1. They typically sympathize with many feminist concerns, including the feminist critique of liberal individualism.
2. But they are critical of what they see as the anti-man, anti-family aspects of feminism.
3. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese sums up this reaction in the title of her book: *Feminism Is Not the Story of My Life*.
4. She and other such writers wish to modify feminism so that it better addresses what they see as the concerns of ordinary women.

D. Some welfare liberals and classical liberals have reacted strongly to aspects of feminism that are critical of liberalism, particularly concerning free speech and pornography. The libertarian Wendy McElroy and the welfare liberal and ACLU President Nadine Strossen here lined up against Catharine MacKinnon and Andrea Dworkin, two radical feminists who were willing to ally themselves, pragmatically, with conservatives to limit the sale of pornography.

Essential Reading:

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. *"Feminism Is Not the Story of My Life."* New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1996. An interesting example of a more conservative perspective *within* feminism.

Supplementary Reading:

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982. Presents Gilligan's work, which made a major impact on "difference feminism." See, for discussion, Larrabee M. J., ed. *An Ethic of Care*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Graglia, F. Carolyn. *Domestic Tranquility: A Brief against Feminism*. Dallas: Spence, 1998. A hard-hitting critique of feminism by a conservative lawyer.

McElroy, Wendy. *A Woman's Right to Pornography*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997. A provocative defense of pornography by a libertarian feminist.

Sommers, Christine. *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994. A defense of liberal feminism, in broadly the tradition of J. S. Mill, against radical feminism.

Strossen, Nadine. *In Defense of Pornography*. New York: New York University Press, 2000. Defense of pornography on free-speech grounds by an academic lawyer and president of the ACLU.

Questions to Consider:

1. Some feminists have argued that "difference feminism" simply leads women to further identify with ideas that have led to their exploitation. Would you agree?
2. Can a feminist really favor pornography?

Lecture Nineteen

Nationalism

Scope: This lecture concerns nationalism as a key example of an approach to politics that stresses issues of identity. We consider the traditional characteristics of nationalism and something of its history and political impact. We look at recent criticisms of nationalism from a variety of intellectual backgrounds, from the classical liberal Friedrich Hayek to the Marxist Eric Hobsbawm. We then turn to the ideas of some of its more recent defenders, including the sociologist Ernest Gellner. In particular, we consider the recent work of political theorists David Miller, who defends nationalism because of its ability to offer a rationale for the welfare state, and Yael Tamir, who defends its compatibility with liberalism. We conclude by reviewing responses to nationalism's recent defenders.

Outline

- I. One of the strongest ways in which identity plays a role in politics relates to nationalism. A new idea from the late eighteenth century on, the history of nationalism has reflected various strands.
 - A. In the eighteenth century, the cosmopolitan, intellectual, and political movement known as the Enlightenment sought to diffuse knowledge and preach a doctrine of rational reform.
 - B. It prompted a reaction that emphasized feeling and community versus reason and individualism, and distinctive national cultures (law, language, customs, and traditions) versus the Enlightenment's cosmopolitanism. This included the gathering of folk material (such as Grimms' fairy tales).
 - C. The eighteenth-century political philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau offered an image of political liberty as involving the decisions of a single, sovereign body, in which citizens legislate for themselves. He held that freedom is not compromised if you impose laws on yourself.
 - D. The idea of autonomy as self-government was initially developed in connection with individuals, then applied to nations.
 - E. The result was the powerful idea that a nation is only free when it governs itself.
 - F. What, though, was meant by "nation"? Different ideas emerged, including variations on a common history, language, religion, territory, culture, or ethnicity. One might also distinguish:

1. An objective view in which the existence of a nation is a matter of fact, although it might be fragmented and require nationalist ideas to revive it;
 2. A subjective view that sees nations as consciously created by people with a shared sense of identity and ideals.
- II. In the nineteenth century, these ideas were especially potent as furnishing grounds for objection to multinational empires and as offering a basis for the formation of new national countries. Later, nationalism offered a basis for revolt against colonial empires.
 - A. The political character of nationalism varied.
 1. Initially, it was liberal.
 2. In the early to mid-twentieth century, Italian Fascism and German National Socialism gave it a bad name.
 3. Conservative governments often used nationalism against socialist internationalism.
 4. After World War II, nationalist revolts against colonial empires often used socialist rhetoric.
 - B. There has been a recent revival of positive views of nationalism, some writers stressing its compatibility with liberalism and others seeing it in terms of popular sovereignty.
- III. In the mid-twentieth century, critics of nationalism included Karl Popper, Friedrich Hayek, and Eric Hobsbawm.
 - A. Popper and Hayek emigrated from Austria and their views are perhaps influenced by nostalgia for the Hapsburg Empire.
 - B. Some critics' views—as in the case of Eric Hobsbawm—were influenced by Marxist internationalism, but their arguments stand on their own feet.
 - C. Mid-twentieth-century critics of nationalism admitted that nationalism was powerful because it draws on very deep emotions, but they claimed that it is problematic.
 1. What nationalists invoke does not exist: There is no single nation, in the sense of a group with a shared culture, language, ethnicity, and so on that works, geographically, as a state.
 2. Nationalism typically relies on bogus history and leads people to be dissatisfied with otherwise good governments for no good reason, nationalist sentiment apart.
 3. Under a nationalist regime, we typically find national minorities, whose position is more difficult than it would be under a multinational empire, because of the nationalist regime's commitment to a homogenized political and cultural nationalism. Such groups would seem to have their own (nationalist) case for independence or for union with some other nation state. (If they do,

this in turn is likely to lead to further national minority problems—a bit like Russian nesting dolls!)

4. Rights of non-nationals are problematic. They may find themselves treated as second-class citizens, with discrimination against their language, religion, and other aspects of culture, and may be seen as potentially disloyal.

IV. Some more recent arguments have been offered for nationalism.

- A. A composite defense can be made from the arguments of Czech-born sociologist and philosopher Ernest Gellner (who offers more sympathetic explanation than advocacy), the British political theorist David Miller, and the Israeli political theorist Yael Tamir.
- B. Nationalism does not deserve the bad press it received in the mid-twentieth century.
 1. It can be liberal.
 2. It can make appropriate provision for minorities. (Tamir draws on the idea of “consociational democracy,” in which each section of society has appropriate state provision reserved for it.)
 3. It can limit self-determination to what would be viable, moderate nation states. Indeed, nationalists might argue that, today, viable states can be very small.
- C. National sentiment is needed to make a modern state function well.
 1. Good politics depends on socialization into a shared culture and on citizens having more than purely pragmatic ties. This can be achieved through moderate nationalism. (Recall here the social capital literature.)
 2. One cannot make much sense of a state if one treats it purely as an organization of mutual benefit. (Loyalty, obligation to the state, citizenship, immigration regulations, and so on cannot be explained in such terms.)
 3. Elements of shared history, culture, and language can be drawn on to foster shared identity, and these can then be reinforced through public education.
- D. We gain from having this national sentiment.
 1. Individually, it provides us with a strong identity.
 2. It allows the opportunity for public celebration and recognition of our identity—something that is appreciated by those who have not had it.
 3. It offers a moral basis for a welfare state, for differential treatment of citizens and non-citizens. (An interesting problem arises from a commitment to moral universalism: in virtue of what do we pick out our fellow citizens and/or residents for special obligations or entitlements? For nationalists, the answer comes from a shared nationality as an element of our individual identity.)

- E. Some nationalists claim that a shared language, national institutions, culture, and so on are necessary to handle industrialization, modernization, and development.
 1. This has been provided by states.
 2. States, if they wish to be modern, have to create a nation.

V. How might critics respond?

- A. Nationalism deserves its bad press.
 1. Nationalism fosters war.
 2. It may give rise to a politics of unreconcilable principles—for example, Serbian attachments to Kosovo or Palestinian and Israeli attachments to Jerusalem.
- B. Problems arise in the relations between nations and states.
 1. If a nation may be a creation of the state, the underlying ideals of nationalism, that is, the view that a nation needs a state, make little sense.
 2. Why not restrict socialization to what is needed for the government to operate, and limit what is ceremonial to what is formally connected with government and, thus, has little cultural significance?
 3. Welfare states treat citizens and non-citizens in different ways. How this is to be justified poses an interesting problem. But is national identity the answer? Often today, people’s links and identifications may be stronger across national boundaries than they are within them.
- C. The question of how active the state needs to be is moot—commercial society seems well able to handle communication and coordination problems on its own. Indeed, as globalization suggests, far from economic development requiring a strong state, it may serve to undermine it.

Essential Reading:

Smith, Anthony. *Nationalism and Modernism*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. This recent work by a specialist on nationalism offers a broad account of different theories of nationalism.

Supplementary Reading:

Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism*, third edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993. The most recent edition of an older and critical work written from a somewhat conservative perspective.

Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, fifth edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971. This is the latest edition of a work on political philosophy written by an Austrian-born philosopher of science and political

theorist, which contains some particularly trenchant criticism of nationalism and a sympathetic yet critical treatment of Marxism.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London and New York: Verso, 1991. This work offers an interesting, influential, and highly sophisticated treatment of a "subjectivist" understanding of nationalism.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983. A useful source for Gellner's sociological approach to the understanding and appreciation of nationalism.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism since 1790*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. This highly critical treatment is written from a Marxist perspective.

Miller, David. *On Nationality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. A powerful defense of a moderate nationalism written from a democratic socialist perspective.

Tamir, Yael. *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993. This is a defense of nationalism and, in particular, an argument about its compatibility with (welfare) liberalism.

Questions to Consider:

1. On balance, is nationalism something to be encouraged?
2. Can a nationalist state make adequate provision for national minorities?

Lecture Twenty

Multiculturalism

Scope: Multiculturalism is a contentious example of contemporary identity-related politics. We begin by examining an older view of immigrant assimilation into established, settler-based cultures and the reasons why this was challenged. Problems for this older view were also posed by other distinctive groupings in these societies. We look at the French in Canada and at the U.S. African-American community that had suffered slavery and subsequent legal and social discrimination and wanted these disadvantages to be recognized and put right. This community did not necessarily favor assimilation into the wider community, but instead, sought recognition of its distinctive identity. These ideas served as a model for aboriginal peoples who had suffered exploitation and the expropriation of their land and for citizens with distinctive cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Outline

- I. What do things look like in settler countries and Europe now?
 - A. Imperialist countries have, since the middle of the twentieth century, received immigrants from their colonies and former colonies.
 - B. People from these and poorer countries frequently migrate to other countries, too.
 - C. Here, a key issue is multiculturalism and issues relating to a plurality of cultures in one country.
- II. European settlers in Canada, the United States, and Australia arrived, negotiated, and fought with indigenous peoples, who typically had forms of land use different from theirs.
 - A. As a result of the impact of European diseases and, over time, military engagements, and the encroachment of European-style agriculture and other activities, indigenous peoples were driven from the better lands.
 - B. Settlers, often legitimating their activities by way of Lockean ideas about property (which did not accord property rights in land to hunters and gatherers), saw their activities as legitimate.
 - C. British colonial governments often had a paternalistic, but ineffectual, concern for indigenous inhabitants.
 - D. Later independent governments' protective policies were often grim in their consequences for the dispirited remnants of aboriginal peoples.

III. Although settlers ultimately came from a variety of countries, the population gradually took on the character of the colonial power.

A. Over time, and especially with compulsory English-language education, English became dominant.

B. We see ongoing controversy (in the United States, from Crèvecoeur in 1782, to reflections in Australia about the role of underlying Irish/English tensions in the Republic referendum in 1999) about the extent to which countries are, or should be, melting pots.

C. There were strong pressures towards homogenization, spurred at times by external events (e.g., the First World War).

IV. It is striking to contrast the ideal of assimilation with that of multiculturalism, which is widely favored today.

A. In broad terms, multiculturalism is a policy of the recognition of, and the according of (limited) assistance to, different cultural identities within the wider scope of Western-style liberal democracies.

B. What multiculturalism amounts to may vary.

1. Multiculturalism may usefully be seen as a partial rejection of the older view that immigrants into settler countries would assimilate into an older, dominant (melting pot) culture.

2. An underlying assumption exists that multiculturalism is, itself, part of liberal theory.

3. In practical terms, what people mean by multiculturalism may differ, which may pose problems.

4. It may mean programs to maintain different cultures.

V. The story of how multiculturalism came to prominence from nowhere is interesting and is in the course of being studied. The following are some suggestions:

A. The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, which included ideas about (national) self-determination, was important.

B. The U.S. civil rights movement made a significant impact.

1. In one sense, however, we can see that the civil rights movement itself did not directly foster multiculturalism, not least because it involved the repudiation of ideas about "separate but equal."

2. What made a more direct mark was the subsequent argument for cultural recognition—ideas about black pride and so on, as well as affirmative action.

3. This then was taken up as a model for other groups, including women, Latinos, gays, and lesbians.

C. Frantz Fanon, a critical follower of the French existentialist philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre, was concerned with issues of identity and the psychological damage done to colonized peoples by their use of the language and culture of others.

D. A Sartre-based approach does not allow for the question: Is what we get from others better than what we had or what we can create for ourselves?

E. Canada had two "founding nations"—Britain and France. French language and culture were, in consequence, accorded a special status against English cultural dominance. The idea of multiculturalism developed as other cultural groups aspired for similar status.

F. Large-scale, non-English-speaking immigration into Australia was strongly encouraged by the government, after World War II. Many immigrants became restive about Australia's assimilationist policies and a good number returned home. This opened governments of different political persuasions to multicultural arguments.

VI. At one level, multiculturalism is little more than humanitarianism, tolerance, and respect for others and the recognition of social pluralism.

A. However, if the government takes on a welfare liberal agenda and is involved in the extensive provision of services, clearly, it needs to accommodate itself to the needs (i.e., the language and culture) of those to whom it provides such services.

B. What about the liberal setting of multiculturalism and respect for that? A problem arises, here, if the cultures in question are not liberal, such as in their treatment of women.

VII. Objections to multiculturalism include classical liberal criticisms.

A. It is not clear that ethnic pride has wider social benefits. It may tie people into disadvantaged patterns of culture.

B. It is not clear why people should care one way or the other about cultural pluralism. If, say, no one any longer speaks Polish or Yiddish in the United States or Australia, why should anyone else be concerned?

C. Similarly, it is not clear why—transitional assistance and humanitarianism aside—public funding should be available to encourage particular cultures and languages.

D. What constitutes a particular cultural identity?

E. Does participation in a particular group identity become mandatory for people of a certain heritage or background?

F. Is there a risk of reverse racism: Do cultural categories dictate certain views and attitudes to their members?

VIII. Classical liberals are happy enough with cultural diversity if people bear the costs of it themselves. Conservatives and nationalists argue that to live together successfully, we need shared ideals of nationality, citizenship, and so on and a shared public language.

IX. A strong line of argument has recently been developed for multiculturalism from a welfare liberal perspective.

- A. The philosophers Charles Taylor and Will Kymlika (who wishes to restrict the application of the argument to aboriginal peoples) are, in various ways, identified with such approaches.
- B. Welfare liberalism is committed to giving governmental assistance to individuals in respect to things that play a fundamental role in their lives, and it has been argued that an individual's culturally based identity plays such a role.

X. An objection could be made that multiculturalism draws its ideas from a generalization of the case of African Americans, and that case is different from voluntary immigration. It is, similarly, understandable that members of aboriginal cultures have resisted being treated as part of a multicultural setting.

XI. However, with European settlement in the Americas and in Australia, there also came commercial society. And this seems increasingly to provide the setting within which all of us have to live.

Essential Reading:

Taylor, Charles, and Gutmann, Amy, eds. *Multiculturalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. An interesting collection on multiculturalism, centered on an essay by the Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor. Gutmann's introduction to the volume is especially recommended.

Supplementary Reading:

Parekh, Bhikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. Defense of multiculturalism by a British academic and race-relations specialist.

Okin, Susan Moller, et al. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999. Contains essays by distinguished writers, grappling with the problems posed by tensions between multiculturalism and liberal feminism.

Lopez, Mark. *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics, 1945–1975*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2000. Detailed study of the emergence of multicultural ideas and their impact on Australian politics.

Kymlika, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. A welfare liberal approach to issues of multiculturalism by a distinguished Canadian philosopher.

_____, ed. *The Rights of Minority Cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. Anthology offering a range of academic perspectives on issues relating to multiculturalism.

Bernstein, Richard. *Dictatorship of Virtue*. New York: Vintage, 1995. An alarmed critique of multiculturalism, by a journalist worried by what it has meant in practical terms, for example, "political correctness."

Questions to Consider:

1. Is it important that minority languages and cultures be preserved? Would it matter if everyone were to assimilate to a single (broad) identity?
2. Are individuals helped or hindered by pride in their own identities and backgrounds?

X. An objection could be made that multiculturalism draws its ideas from a generalization of the case of African Americans, and that case is different from voluntary immigration. It is, similarly, understandable that members of aboriginal cultures have resisted being treated as part of a multicultural setting.

XI. However, with European settlement in the Americas and in Australia, there also came commercial society. And this seems increasingly to provide the setting within which all of us have to live.

Essential Reading:

Taylor, Charles, and Gutmann, Amy, eds. *Multiculturalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. An interesting collection centered on an essay by the Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor. Gutmann's introduction to the volume is especially recommended.

Supplementary Reading:

Parekh, Bhikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. Defense of multiculturalism by a British academic and race-relations specialist.

Okin, Susan Moller, et al. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999. Contains essays by distinguished writers, grappling with the problems posed by tensions between multiculturalism and liberal feminism.

Lopez, Mark. *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics, 1945–1975*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2000. Detailed study of the emergence of multicultural ideas and their impact on Australian politics.

Kymlika, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. A welfare liberal approach to issues of multiculturalism by a distinguished Canadian philosopher.

Lecture Twenty-One

Gay and Lesbian Politics

Scope: We look briefly at the social and political treatment of gays and lesbians up to our own day. We consider the case made recently by Andrew Sullivan for the legalization of same-sex marriage. Sullivan's case is striking, because, in many respects, it is conservative in its character. Some gays and lesbians have argued, controversially, along lines that bring them close to multiculturalism. Some, on moral and especially on religious grounds, are opposed to the legitimization of homosexuality and to its being accorded public recognition as an acceptable option. Some gays and lesbians have argued against pigeonholing by way of government-approved identities. This makes for a complex set of arguments that range wider, in their ramifications, than matters that only concern gays and lesbians.

Outline

- I. Some contemporary discussions highlight some issues we have dealt with earlier and lead us to our final topics. In this lecture, we examine the following issues:
 - A. Andrew Sullivan's conservative case for gay and lesbian marriage;
 - B. multiculturalism as a model for gay and lesbian politics;
 - C. "queer theory" treated as a response;
 - D. conservative objections and the political problem of religious authority.
- II. The topic of homosexuality has been much discussed in academic literature in recent years.
 - A. Homosexuality can be looked at in physical or cultural terms.
 - B. Physically, it has a long history. In some cultures it was accepted; in others, it was subject to religious and legal sanctions.
 - C. In Western countries, from the late nineteenth century onward, cases started to be made for a change of attitude.
 1. In the United States and Britain, some people argued that homosexuality should be seen as a medical condition, rather than as immoral or criminal.
 2. Arguments were offered for the decriminalization and toleration of homosexual behavior.
 3. Organizations such as the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis, were set up.
 4. In Britain, liberal pressures led to the legalization of homosexual acts between adult males in private. (Sexual activity between women was not illegal.)

5. During the 1960s, ideas about sexual liberation led to gay liberation movements.
 6. Reactions to heavy-handed policing in New York gay bars led to riots and more militant demands for gay rights.
 7. In addition, commercial interests centered on a gay and lesbian clientele became significant.
 8. Participation along the lines of the ethnic-community model was cemented with the coming of the HIV-AIDS epidemic.
 9. Subsequently, pressure has been exercised for anti-discrimination legislation to include sexual orientation, and some employers have started to offer benefits to same-sex partners.
- D. Three issues remain the subjects of controversy in the United States:
1. Although gays and lesbians have become increasingly present in society, anti-sodomy legislation is still on the law books of many states.
 2. Similarly, attempts to legalize the employment of people who are openly gay or lesbian in the armed forces have not been successful, despite presidential support. (The situation is different in the armed forces of some other English-speaking countries.)
 3. Attempts to make civil marriage, or some kind of equivalent status, available to gays and lesbians have been the subject of intense controversy.

III. Andrew Sullivan made a conservative case for same-sex marriage.

- A. Andrew Sullivan, in his *Virtually Normal*, made what might be described as a conservative case for the recognition of same-sex marriage. The key arguments are these:
 1. People are, in fact, living in same-sex partnerships, which suffer from real and harmful disabilities in the public realm. For example, their relationship and special status to one another may not be recognized if a partner dies or is ill in the hospital.
 2. It is also problematic that the character of a long-standing relationship should not be recognized in social and work settings.
 3. Marriage is good for people.
 4. Marriage should be available to same-sex partners who wish it. (The counterargument, based on children, typically founders, because childless heterosexual couples benefit from marriage.)
 5. These arguments can be called conservative, because they are concerned with the benefits that institutions bring to people's lives.
- B. One might see Sullivan's approach as assimilationist—something that one can contrast with an identity-based (or ethnic) approach as this was found in the gay rights movement.
- C. Those who stress identity have taken issue with Sullivan on the grounds that gays and lesbians have developed their own lifestyle.

IV. A line of critical response exists to both viewpoints, which may be discovered at either end of the political spectrum.

- A. On the one side, criticism may be voiced by libertarians, who stress individual freedom in a system that recognizes individual rights.
 - 1. Under such a system, individuals may choose to live and associate with others as they wish.
 - 2. From such a perspective, the idea that there is a single normative gay identity is not attractive; some gays and lesbians may reject the idea of a single identity based on sexuality.
 - 3. That this identity should be government-supervised and government-recognized is worse.
- B. On the other side, we find ideas that have been developed by philosophers and taken up by some activists, under the heading of "queer theory."
 - 1. This at times is purely speculative literature about the conventional character not only of what, if one thinks back to radical feminism, is gender, but even to much of sex.
 - 2. In more practical and political terms, the theory tends to stress the variety and conventionality of roles and relationships and to emphasize individuality and spontaneity against the idea that there are natural categories into which people's behavior and character should fit.
 - 3. This, in turn, has led to a critical reaction against ideas about an "ethnic" gay identity and to suggestions like those of Sullivan.
- C. However, such approaches do not seem to address problems of social convention, which Sullivan's approach addressed.

V. Conservative objections may be raised to gay rights.

- A. Objections may be based on conservative ideas about social institutions.
 - 1. We may think that existing ideas and attitudes are functional within our society, that there are good reasons for maintaining them.
 - 2. Identity theorists stress that meanings operate as a system. This, a conservative could argue, means that changes to a system of gender relationships will have effects elsewhere, for example, in male camaraderie, close relationships in a team, or in the armed forces, which those involved may not wish to see opened to questioning in this way.
- B. We can also find religious-based objections, but these raise wider questions that will be pursued in the next lecture.

Essential Reading:

Sullivan, Andrew. *Virtually Normal*. New York: Vintage, 1996. A challenging book by a writer whose broad views are conservative or classical liberal, in favor of gay marriage. He engages with religious-based objections to his views.

Supplementary Reading:

Sullivan, Andrew, ed. *Same Sex Marriage: Pro and Con—A Reader*. New York: Vintage, 1997. A useful anthology, with articles for and against same-sex marriage.

Baird, Robert M., and Rosenbaum, Stuart E., eds. *Same Sex Marriage: The Moral and Legal Debate*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1997. Another anthology, with articles for and against same-sex marriage.

Jagose, Annamarie. *Queer Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press, 1997. This selection offers a full but accessible guide to ideas about same-sex relationships, including to some of the more turgid, but nonetheless challenging, recent theoretical ideas in this field.

Halperin, David. *Saint Foucault*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. A controversial but impassioned study of what Halperin takes to be the significance of Michel Foucault for the situation of gays and lesbians. The material is difficult, but it makes for a striking contrast with Sullivan.

Questions to Consider:

- 1. Is sexual preference just a private issue?
- 2. Does Sullivan make a case for same-sex marriage that you (the reader) find telling?

Lecture Twenty-Two

Religion and Politics in the West

Scope: In this and the next lecture, we return to some of our initial disagreements in the mainstream of politics. Secular and broadly liberal ideas are, in our own societies, dominant over specific religious values. But this is not the case across the world; consider Ayatollah Khomeini's death sentence against Salman Rushdie for his *Satanic Verses*. There is a parallel between this and the execution of the young Scottish student Thomas Aikenhead for blasphemy, in Edinburgh in 1697. Political views that have been our concern—liberalism, conservatism, and socialism—have been shaped by religious ideas. But we have subsequently developed a secular and broadly liberal framework, which is in turn imposed on religious ideas.

Outline

- I. In Western countries, these days, there are many individuals and communities for whom religious faith is of key importance. (The United States is exceptional by virtue of its relatively strong records for attendance at places of worship. In many other comparable countries, including England and Australia, such rates are very low.)
 - A. In one way or another, however, the wider social ethos is decidedly secular, either because a separation between church and state is built into the constitution or because it is a product of religious liberalism or indifference.
 - B. In this lecture, we explore two themes:
 1. the character of our secular polities;
 2. the problem of the claims of religion in relation to secular political authority.
 - C. This discussion leads to an issue that will be our concern in the next lecture: the problem of religious and nonreligious toleration.
 - D. We look at religious views insofar as they are at odds with liberalism.
 - E. Churches may hold that their role in relation to the state should be limited. This may limit clashes with the state, but it is important to see that what governs this judgment is a religious doctrine. The problem of how religious and secular ideas are to interrelate has not necessarily been resolved.
- II. In Western countries, religious liberalism has historically triumphed, either because of a formal split between church and state or because religious ideas in the public realm are interpreted in a liberal manner. (It is, however,

interesting to see the increasing role being played by personal declarations of religious faith among U.S. presidential candidates.)

- A. Today, liberalism in religion has four characteristics.
 - B. Religion is a semiprivate matter; the full weight of the law is not placed behind any specific church. Religious toleration exists. A kind of nonsectarian religious celebration may often take place as part of public occasions.
 - C. Exemptions from laws or regulations may be made for those following some religious practices (e.g. Sikhs' turbans, ritual slaughter, trading laws, sexual discrimination in religious schools).
 - D. But where these exemptions occur, they may not be extended to those who are members of what are taken to be cults.
 - E. More generally, we tend to limit individual action only when it is deemed harmful to the interests of others (cf. J. S. Mill).
 - F. But what counts as harm and what is an "interest"?
 1. Here, religious concerns are typically trumped by core liberal concerns, such as secular education for citizenship in public schools in Western countries versus Islamic or conservative Christian education.
 2. More generally, liberal ideas about individual rights win out over religious teaching on issues of so-called victimless crime, including homosexuality, prostitution, and so on.
 3. Note also the decline of blasphemy law.
- III. However, in 1989, the Ayatollah Khomeini passed a judgment under Islamic religious law on Salman Rushdie that he, and others involved in the production of *The Satanic Verses* if they knew what they were doing, were sentenced to death.
 - A. This was an occasion for outrage on the part of some, reflection on the part of others.
 - B. Clearly, this would not happen in Western countries today—in the United States because of constitutional protections; in other countries because of socially dominant liberal views of religion or because of religious indifference.
 - C. But one does not have to look too far back in Western history to find a similar case. A young Scottish student (Aikenhead) was executed for blasphemy at the end of the seventeenth century.

IV. Historically, religious influence was significant in Western political thought; the secular ideas we now take as characteristically "Western" are a recent product.

A. Liberal ideas in Locke were based on rights, which were, in turn, grounded in duties to God; the equality of all before God also provided a basis for an equality of rights.

1. Liberal ideas, in their contemporary sense, first developed in a religious setting, but they were eventually asserted independently and given priority.
2. This independence, however, leaves the secular liberal with the interesting task of finding an alternative nonreligious basis for fundamental liberal ideals.

B. Conservatives have often stressed the significance of religious values over individual choice.

1. They have not been happy about the granting of free individual choice if that choice is to do wrong.
2. Some conservatives have stressed the fallibility of human nature (e.g., by reference to the Fall of man) and the dangers of unchecked human freedom.

C. Some socialists base their approach on the value of each individual as the basis for substantive equality, something that they relate to their Christian ideals.

1. Some strands of socialism and welfare liberalism appeal to a duty to secure the well-being of others when our own needs are met (cf. John Locke).
2. Some have, on religious grounds, felt that altruism, not self-interest, should be the basis for our social arrangements.
3. Note, also, the phenomenon of socialist "liberation theology" in Latin America.

V. Nonetheless, we now typically live in secular societies. Some problems surrounding the claims of religion in such societies include the following:

A. The kind of authority claimed by religious knowledge is now taken as private and as less than that of secular ideas, which are authenticated by public, inter-subjective, often empirical means. (We might note that the status of liberal, secular ideals is itself hardly subject to inter-subjective (or empirical validation!).)

B. Giving priority to civil rules and to the toleration of others may not be an intrinsic part of particular religious traditions.

C. A specific problem arises in the United States—namely, of the authority of the Constitution over specific religious values: On what basis do you accord a secular document priority over what you believe to be God-given truth?

D. More generally, what if religious values are at odds with those of the wider society in which you are living?

VI. Let us look at some cases.

A. What if we believe that abortion is wrong? Should we tolerate the majority practicing abortion if we could do something about it? Or if we are in a majority, is there any reason why we should allow a minority to behave in this manner?

B. What if we believe, for religious reasons, that eating animals or the purely instrumental use of the environment is evil?

C. What if we believe that the practice of homosexuality is wrong and may call down divine judgment on those who tolerate it?

D. Various kinds of issues arise:

1. Should people tolerate others doing what they believe is wrong?
2. Should these matters be subject to a majority decision that must be respected?
3. Should adults have the right to practice the values that they favor, at least in their communities?
4. How should disagreements about such questions be resolved?

VII. Liberals tend to assume that liberal values are paramount, that specific religious views must give way when there is a clash. But why and on what basis?

A. On one level, they are simply the values that those in the West (or at least, those with power and who do not hold other values) are used to.

B. Are the arguments for liberal values better than arguments for different religious values?

C. Is it assumed that modern society must have liberal values and, if so, why? As byproduct of capitalism?

D. Is the case for liberalism pragmatic? If so, is it at risk on the basis of changes in the social balance of power, or numbers?

E. For liberals, especially classical liberals, non-liberal values or ways of life are fine among consenting adults. But this is typically not how traditional religious believers see things.

F. Raising these issues is not a plea for the reintroduction of execution for blasphemy or anything similar. It is a plea for the idea that we should step back from our current ways of doing things and appreciate that they are rather more problematic than we sometimes imagine.

Essential Reading:

Marquand, David, and Nettler, Ronald L., eds. *Religion and Democracy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000. A recent collection of essays dealing with many

aspects of the interrelationship between politics and religion in a range of different cultures.

Supplementary Reading:

Hunter, Michael, and Wootton, David, eds. *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. Includes a discussion of the execution of Aikenhead.

Pipes, Daniel. *The Rushdie Affair: The Novel, the Ayatollah, and the West*. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1990. An analysis of Rushdie's novel and the background to the Ayatollah Khomeini's judgment against it.

Hampsher-Monk, Iain. *A History of Modern Political Thought*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992. A first-rate history of modern political thought, from which can be extracted ideas about the interplay between religious ideas and politics in a number of key thinkers.

Questions to Consider:

1. Just what should we do if we believe that the law allows things to occur that are evil?
2. Can the religious person in the United States legitimately grant the U.S. Constitution priority over the teachings of his or her religion?

Lecture Twenty-Three

Toleration, Censorship, and Pornography

Scope: In this lecture, we take further some issues raised in the previous lecture, relating them back to wider themes from the course. First, we look at some of the history of arguments for religious toleration and pose a question. Historically, Christianity did not favor toleration through much of its history. The arguments that are often offered for toleration, such as those of John Locke and John Stuart Mill, are, respectively, feeble or rest on ideas that traditional religious believers cannot readily accept. We look, in particular, at Mill's ideas about freedom of opinion, which are frequently echoed today by those who favor not just religious toleration, but freedom of expression generally. We also look at the rather limited consequences that follow if his argument were accepted. This issue is significant for some recent controversies about pornography and freedom of expression.

Outline

- I. Historically, Christianity was not happy about dissent: Heretics do harm to their own souls and to those of others.
 - A. This raises the problem that the kind of certainty claimed by believers does not easily fit a laissez faire attitude toward religious belief at the level of public policy.
 - B. The Reformation marked a split in Western Christianity as an unintended consequence of attempted reform.
 - C. The Reformers themselves were not keen on toleration of everything.
 - D. As consequence of the failure of religious wars to come to any conclusion, toleration of a kind came about, with the doctrine that the ruler decides the faith of a country.
 - E. Clearly this was not general toleration, and such a situation always leaves open the possibility of reopening the issue if you think you can win!
- II. General arguments were offered for toleration, such as those of John Locke.
 - A. Locke offered a well-known, but in my view, hopelessly feeble argument.
 1. He stressed that salvation required the free decision of a believer, and that this could not be coerced.
 2. One key problem is that, even if one accepted Locke's views, it is one thing to say that one cannot coerce assent and quite another to say that one should not do everything that one could to discourage the spread of subversive ideas.

B. Better known are the ideas of John Stuart Mill:

1. John Stuart Mill, in *On Liberty*, argues against the suppression of opinion because of the fallibility of human knowledge and the importance of criticism as the path to truth.
2. Chapter two of *On Liberty* is well worth reading because its arguments have been very influential. Note Mill's own summary of his argument at the end of the chapter, which says, even more briefly: (1) A silenced opinion might be true; (2) even if it is not true, it may contain a portion of truth; (3) even if it is false, it is important that truths be held with knowledge of their grounds, rather than as dogma; (4) unless they are so held, their content may be enfeebled.
3. Because Mill's argument is referred to so often, a few critical comments might be in order:

C. Mill is offering an interesting line of argument, but its scope is more limited than people often realize.

1. Protection is for the sake of truth, not pleasure or artistic expression (though Mill as a utilitarian has other things to say about freedom and pleasure).
2. Mill's argument for toleration for the sake of pursuing truth does not necessarily justify unrestricted freedom of expression. One might argue that all that would be required would be some appropriate forum for discussion, as opposed to the ability to challenge anything, anywhere.
3. One might further argue that although knowledge is fallible, we can discriminate on the basis of how expert discussion has gone so far and restrict what is publicly accessible to that. We might warn that such knowledge is fallible and indicate where people should go for other opinions. But fallibility is one thing; anything goes, another.
- D. In making these points, I am not claiming that they are, necessarily, correct; only that there is a risk that we move too quickly from Mill's arguments to the view that toleration has been vindicated, generally.
- E. In our context, we find one other key issue: It is not easy to see how Mill's arguments relate to the kind of certainty that was traditionally taken to play a core role in Christianity. His approach appeals to a kind of fallibility regarding our knowledge, which the traditional believer would be likely to repudiate in the religious field.

III. Historically, mid-twentieth-century judicial moves to lift censorship on materials available to adults were often seen as liberating, for example, *Fanny Hill* in the United States and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in the United Kingdom.

- A. But there has since been much debate about how we should interpret the free availability of sexually oriented materials.**

- B. Some argue that if the materials are produced without coercion, there is no problem about their availability to adults.**
- C. These people may qualify this statement by saying that the material should not feature or be about children (including older people who look like children) or that it should not be violent (or if it is violent, that this be produced consensually).**
- D. Others argue that even if such materials are produced consensually, they are problematic because of the kind of attitude toward women that they encourage, because pornography leads to violence toward women, because these materials influence the vulnerable, and so on.**
- E. But is it society's job to protect people from harming themselves in this way?**
- F. This question brings us back to some of those from which we started these lectures.**

Essential Reading:

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. In his *On Liberty and Other Essays*, ed. John Gray. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Mill's *On Liberty* is really worth reading; not only is it an important and influential work in itself, but also to see if you think that I have been fair to him!

Supplementary Reading:

Locke, John. *A Letter Concerning Toleration*. See, for example, Locke, John, Horton, John, and Mendus, Susan. *John Locke: A Letter Concerning Toleration in Focus*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

MacKinnon, Catharine. *Only Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. A brief, hard-hitting critique of pornography by a leading academic feminist, combining analysis and emotion.

Strossen, Nadine. *In Defense of Pornography*. New York: New York University Press, 2000. Defense of pornography on free-speech grounds by an academic lawyer and president of the ACLU.

Lovelace, Linda. *Ordeal: An Autobiography*. New York: Bell, 1980. Linda Lovelace's autobiography is currently out of print but so many were sold that it is likely to be readily available. It is interesting, because it has become the object of argument between the critics and defenders of pornography.

Questions to Consider:

1. Is religious toleration a view that can be embraced only by the religious skeptic?
2. If someone is happy to take money for appearing in a pornographic movie, should they be prevented from doing so?

Lecture Twenty-Four

The End of History

Scope: A critic might ask: Does not the collapse of the Soviet Union in fact suggest that there is not much room for argument about ideas in politics? Does it not show that liberal democracy is the only answer to political questions? Such a view—which echoes the liberal theme that liberalism is the fate of everyone—was explored by the American writer Francis Fukuyama. His “The End of History?” and *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992) set out such a view, in a forceful and striking manner. The lecture concludes by considering how people who hold the various ideas we have looked at might respond to Fukuyama’s thesis.

Outline

- I. In the summer of 1989, Francis Fukuyama published an article, “The End of History?” that reflects on the significance of the collapse of the Soviet Union. In 1992, he published a book, *The End of History and the Last Man*.
 - A. Fukuyama, an American with a Ph.D. in political science, is a former State Department policy analyst and a professor at George Mason University.
 - B. What did he mean by “The End of History?”
 1. Liberal democracy is the final stage in political development.
 2. Its ideals are imperfectly realized, but there are now no serious alternative ideals or programs.
 3. The idea of “The End of History” is to be found in the work of Hegel.
 4. The end of Fascism, then of authoritarian regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, Fukuyama argued, leaves liberal democracy unchallenged.
 - C. Note that Fukuyama is not claiming that all problems have been resolved—just that we must resolve them within liberal democracy.
 1. A range of choices may be available within liberal democracy, from American individualism to Swedish social democracy.
 2. Many countries are still “within history”; that is, they are subject to ideological contention and may champion alternatives to liberal democracy, but liberal democracy is the eventual end-point for everyone.
- II. Why did Fukuyama take this view?
 - A. He argued that it was the product of several tendencies:
 1. the cumulative growth of science;

2. the superiority of market-based organization over economic alternatives.

- B. Why could we not have a combination of markets and political authoritarianism?
 1. Fukuyama answered this question by saying that such regimes were not stable.
 2. He also said that people need recognition, and that this need is satisfied by formal rights in democracies.

III. In his book, Fukuyama made some modifications to his initial claims.

- A. He suggested that Japanese-style capitalism could offer an alternative, for Asia.
 - B. Recognition poses some problems:
 1. Those on the left argue that inequality is a problem for recognition in liberal democratic societies. Fukuyama is skeptical about this.
 2. Those on the right say that people have a need for heroism and superiority over others; Fukuyama takes this notion very seriously.

IV. Fukuyama was aware that people might take issue with his views and tried to anticipate criticism (or, in the book, to answer some of the critics of his article).

- A. What about nationalism? Fukuyama argues that this would not be a long-term problem—it had already been tamed in Western Europe.
 - B. Islamic politics? Of this, he is dismissive. He believes that it does not furnish a coherent alternative to liberal democracy and it only looks impressive because of Middle Eastern oil.
 - C. Ecological issues and feminism? These, he argues, are not alternatives. Rather, they highlight problems to be resolved in liberal democracy.
 - D. What about other ideals? These are to be handled in liberal democracy. Liberalism’s privatization of religion is offered as a model.

V. Fukuyama makes some striking claims, but he backtracks somewhat in the book. We might still ask some pointed questions about his work:

- A. Do science, economics, and people’s wish for recognition lead where he suggests?
 - B. Are there current—or possible—alternatives to liberal democracy?
 - C. Is Fukuyama’s analysis too focused on Western society?
 - D. What about international issues, including issues from the perspective of those who are not powerful but are suffering from environmental problems?

VI. We can look back at the course based on our discussion of Fukuyama.

- A. Welfare and classical liberals would typically say: We do not disagree with Fukuyama’s broad picture of things. But what is crucial is which

interpretation of liberalism, of freedom, and of rights we are going to take up?

- B. Also, issues arise around the question of how we are going to interpret the democracy side of liberal democracy and how that relates to liberalism. Much is still left to be argued over and worked out.
- C. Conservatives are likely to say that they would agree with Fukuyama about the bankruptcy of socialism and authoritarianism. But they would argue that he has not appreciated the kind of moral and social crisis into which liberalism has led us. Clearly, we cannot rest with liberal democracy.
- D. Similarly, but from a very different perspective, left-wing communitarians will object to his picture of a triumph of liberalism and argue that we need to do things in a different way from traditional liberalism.
- E. Libertarians will be unhappy, too. Fukuyama's brand of liberalism is much too statist, while the democracy that he favors is collectivist.
- F. Many of those concerned with social capital will argue, with communitarians, that some things are going badly wrong. Although they would agree that we must work in a liberal democratic framework, they would argue that Fukuyama does not address some of the key issues of what makes for a good society.
- G. Many of those concerned with environmental issues are likely to reject Fukuyama's ideas completely. They would argue that his vision of the end of history is not sustainable; particularly if liberal democracy, as understood in the Western pattern, is seen as the goal for everyone. They would argue that the practical problems of environmental constraints (and, the deep ecologists would say, value-related problems, too) should lead us to a fundamental rethinking of our ideals and programs.
- H. Socialists, too, would reject his approach. Almost all socialists, including Marxists, would repudiate the view that the Soviet Union had anything to do with what they mean by socialism (social ownership, democratic control, and concern for the well-being of everyone). Liberal democracy, they would say, is just another name for business as usual and the continuation of the kinds of things that they dispute.
- I. Feminists have many different voices. But they would surely argue that the issues that feminism has raised should prompt us into a radical rethinking of how society should be organized and how we should think of ourselves. If this can be done in what Fukuyama calls liberal democracy, then this simply shows that this is a very general and vague idea. Otherwise, our ideas about both liberalism and democracy need reworking.

J. Nationalists would argue that, rather than something that is a kind of infant disease, their ideas are now coming into their own, even in Western Europe, where the development of the European Community and globalization has also led to a strengthened concern about cultural and national identity.

K. Those concerned with identity politics would argue, as do feminists, that Fukuyama's liberal democracy is much too general a term. If it means the kind of arrangements that we have had up to now, then it needs radical rethinking. If it is a framework within which such things can be accommodated, then it is so general as to be of little use.

Essential Reading:

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 1992. In this book, Fukuyama argues that liberal democracy represents the final stage in human political development.

Supplementary Reading:

Bell, Daniel P. *The End of Ideology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. First published in 1960, this book also forecast the end of ideology—only to be surprised by the revival of Marxism by the New Left at the end of the decade.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Touchstone, 1998. Another “big picture” view of the situation after the collapse of the Soviet Union, if you have a taste for such things, by a veteran writer on international relations.

Questions to Consider:

1. Has Fukuyama got things just about right?
2. To what extent can the concerns that we have met with during this course be accommodated in “liberal democracy”?

Timeline

427 B.C.	Birth of Plato
347 B.C.	Death of Plato
168 B.C.	Beginning of Maccabean Revolt
142 B.C.	Suppression of Maccabean Revolt
1364	Birth of Christine de Pisan
1430	Death of Christine de Pisan
1622	Birth of Algernon Sydney
1630	Birth of Charles II
1632	Birth of John Locke
1671	Birth of Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury
1682	John Locke and the Earl of Shaftesbury flee England to the Netherlands
1683	Death of Algernon Sydney
1685	Death of Charles II
1688	The Glorious Revolution and the abdication/deposition of James II
1689	Publication of <i>A Letter Concerning Toleration</i> by John Locke
1690	Publication of <i>The Two Treatises of Government</i> by John Locke
1697	Execution of Thomas Aikenhead for blasphemy in Edinburgh, Scotland
1704	Death of John Locke
1709	Birth of John Cleland
1712	Birth of Jean-Jacques Rousseau
1713	Death of Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury
1723	Birth of Adam Smith
1729	Birth of Edmund Burke
1743	Birth of Thomas Jefferson

1748	Birth of Jeremy Bentham
1770	Birth of William Wordsworth
1772	Birth of Samuel Taylor Coleridge
1772	Birth of Charles Fourier
1773	Birth of James Mill
1776	Publication of <i>An Inquiry Concerning the Nature and Cause of the Wealth of Nations</i> by Adam Smith
1776	Outbreak of the American Revolution
1778	Death of Jean-Jacques Rousseau
1789	Outbreak of the French Revolution
1790	Death of Adam Smith
1797	Death of Edmund Burke
1805	Birth of Alexis de Tocqueville
1806	Birth of John Stuart Mill
1815	Restoration of the Bourbons to the French throne
1818	Birth of Karl Marx
1820	Birth of Friedrich Engels
1826	Death of Thomas Jefferson
1832	Death of Jeremy Bentham
1834	Death of Samuel Taylor Coleridge
1835	Publication of volume one of <i>Democracy in America</i> by Alexis de Tocqueville
1836	Death of James Mill
1840	Publication of volume two of <i>Democracy in America</i> by Alexis de Tocqueville
1848	Publication of <i>The Communist Manifesto</i> by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels
1859	Death of Alexis de Tocqueville
1859	Publication of <i>On Liberty</i> by John Stuart Mill

1861.....Composition of *On the Subjection of Women*
by John Stuart Mill

1861.....Foundation of the modern state of Italy

1864.....Birth of Max Weber

1869.....Publication of *On the Subjection of Women*
by John Stuart Mill

1870.....The Paris Commune

1871.....Foundation of the modern state of Germany

1873.....Death of John Stuart Mill

1879.....Birth of Joseph Stalin

1883.....Birth of John Maynard Keynes

1883.....Death of Karl Marx

1890.....Birth of Dwight Eisenhower

1895.....Death of Friedrich Engels

1899.....Birth of Friedrich von Hayek

1901.....Birth of Michael Oakeshott

1901.....Birth of Ruhola (the Ayatollah) Khomeini

1902.....Birth of Karl Popper

1907.....Birth of Isaiah Berlin

1911.....Birth of Ronald Reagan

1913.....Death of Ferdinand de Saussure

1917.....Outbreak of the Russian Revolution and the
beginning of the Soviet Union

1917.....Birth of John Fitzgerald Kennedy

1919.....Birth of James Buchanan

1920.....Death of Max Weber

1920.....Birth of Irving Kristol

1921.....Birth of John Rawls

1922.....Birth of Thomas Kuhn

1922.....The coming to power of the Fascists in Italy

1925.....Birth of Frantz Fanon

1925.....Birth of Margaret Thatcher

1926.....Birth of Murray Rothbard

1927.....Birth of Patrick Moynihan

1928.....Publication of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* by
D. H. Lawrence

1929.....Beginning of the Great Depression

1933.....The coming to power of the National
Socialists in Germany

1936.....Publication of *The General Theory of
Employment, Interest and Money* by John
Maynard Keynes

1936.....Birth of Carol Gilligan

1938.....Birth of Robert Nozick

1938.....Birth of Pat Buchanan

1939.....Outbreak of World War Two

1942.....Birth of Newt Gingrich

1945.....Conclusion of World War Two

1946.....Death of John Maynard Keynes

1947.....Birth of Salman Rushdie

1953.....Death of Joseph Stalin

1953.....Birth of David Boaz

1961.....Death of Frantz Fanon

1962.....Publication of *The Structure of Scientific
Revolutions* by T. S. Kuhn

1963.....Death of John Fitzgerald Kennedy

1963.....Publication of *The Feminine Mystique* by
Betty Friedan

1969.....Death of Dwight Eisenhower

1970.....Publication of *Sexual Politics* by Kate
Millett

1971.....Publication of *A Theory of Justice* by John
Rawls

1972.....	Distinction between “deep” and “shallow” ecology by Arne Naess
1974.....	Publication of <i>Anarchy, the State and Utopia</i> by Robert Nozick
1976.....	Publication of <i>Animal Liberation</i> by Peter Singer
1979.....	Introduction of the Gaia theory by James Lovelock
1979.....	Margaret Thatcher appointed Prime Minister of the United Kingdom
1979.....	The Ayatollah Khomeini overthrows the Shah of Iran
1980.....	Death of Jean-Paul Sartre
1981.....	Ronald Reagan elected President of the United States
1982.....	Publication of <i>In a Different Voice</i> by Carol Gilligan
1988.....	Publication of <i>The Satanic Verses</i> by Salman Rushdie
1989.....	The Ayatollah Khomeini announces a <i>fatwah</i> on Salman Rushdie
1990.....	Death of Michael Oakeshott
1993.....	Publication of <i>Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy</i> by Robert Putnam
1998.....	Publication of <i>Libertarianism</i> by David Boaz
2000.....	Publication of <i>Bowling Alone</i> by Robert Putnam

Glossary

Remember, the meaning and content of political terms is itself part of what is contested in politics. Both those who advocate ideas in politics and those who criticize them often seek to define them in ways that reflect their ideals and interests. One important goal of this lecture series is to allow you to understand the different ways in which these terms are used and why. The following glossary is offered, therefore, as a very rough guide only to terms that you will come across in the course of these lectures; the definitions should provide enough of a context for you to be able to read around them.

Affirmative action: deliberate policies designed to overcome a history of past injustices toward members of some group by promoting their access to positions of social, political, or economic power.

Capitalism: an economic arrangement in which decisions concerning the production and distribution of goods are primarily left up to the operations of the **free market**. Capitalism is often associated today with the existence of the **liberal democracy**, but these ideas are, in fact, conceptually distinct.

Communitarianism: a school of political thought that emphasizes the importance of strong communities to human flourishing. Communitarians advocate institutions and policies intended to protect, foster, and maintain “community.” They are sometimes prepared to accept restrictions of individual liberty toward this goal.

Conservatism: an approach to politics that emphasizes the dangers involved in rapid change and seeks to preserve and extend the wisdom inherent in existing customs and institutions.

Deep ecology: the belief that we should be concerned for the integrity of ecosystems and the flourishing of nonhuman species for their own sake. Some deep ecologists have argued that nonhuman animals (and, perhaps, plants or even ecosystems themselves) should be understood to possess fundamental rights. Others have claimed that the natural world has “intrinsic value” and should be interfered with as little as possible. See also (in contrast): **shallow ecology**.

Ecology: the study of the relations of living organisms to their environment. Alternatively: those networks of relations themselves.

Existentialism: a philosophy concerned with the fundamental question of the meaning of human existence that emphasizes the role of individuals in creating meaning in the world. The major thinkers of existentialism are the Danish philosopher Soren Kierkegaard, the German philosopher Martin Heidegger, and the French writers Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir. The work of the novelists Albert Camus and Franz Kafka is also strongly associated with this tradition.

Externalities (in economics): negative consequences or costs flowing from the production process that do not accrue solely to the producer.

Fascism: an ideology defined primarily by reference to the politics of the Italian Fascist Party of Mussolini and the National Socialist German Workers Party of Adolph Hitler. It combines elements of **socialist** thought with a strong **nationalism** and a pragmatic acceptance of **capitalist** economic relations.

Feminism: an ideology premised on an analysis of the subordinate position of women in society and the need for political struggle against it. Feminism is often divided into:

Liberal feminism: which holds that overcoming the oppression of, and discrimination against, women is the conclusion (or, perhaps, a natural extension) of the liberal project.

Socialist feminism: which seeks to use socialist ideas to analyze the oppression of women and holds that this oppression can be overcome only through the establishment of socialism. Socialist feminists typically trace the origins of women's oppression to the unpaid labor they perform in the family.

Radical feminism: which argues that women's oppression stems from the fact that our society is most fundamentally a **patriarchy** and that women need to organize separately from men to pursue their own interests. Radical feminists have also advocated lesbianism as a political stance in opposition to existing heterosexual relationships, which they argue serve the interests of men.

Free market: an economic arrangement under which the price of goods and services, including labor, is determined by the uncoerced interactions of multiple independent buyers and sellers.

Ideology: the broad assumptions within which people understand and interpret the world; these may or may not be ideas of which we are conscious.

Individualism: the idea that society should be analyzed in terms of the nature of, and relations between, individuals. Also, the belief that only the interests and well being of individuals matter when evaluating the organization of society. Individualism has a strong historical association with **liberalism** and is often contrasted with **communitarianism**, **socialism**, **fascism**, **totalitarianism**, and **nationalism**.

Laissez (or laissez) faire: the doctrine that the state should not intervene in economic affairs, which should as much as possible be left to the domain of the **free market**.

Liberal democracy: a society in which individual rights are respected and political power is exercised by parties chosen in regular, free, and open elections and within limits set by constitutionalism and respect for the rule of law.

Liberalism: the belief that society should be organized to promote the freedom and flourishing of individuals. Liberalism is often divided into:

Classical liberalism: which emphasizes the importance of individual rights that may be threatened by the power of government. Classical liberals typically argue that the role of government should be limited to the protection of the rights of individuals and that economic affairs should be left to the operations of the **free market**.

Welfare liberalism: which holds that the freedom and flourishing of individuals can be attained only if they have access to certain basic resources, such as health care, education, and housing, and that the state, therefore, has an obligation to provide these resources. Doing so will necessarily involve some interference in the operations of the **free market**, at the very least because the taxation required to provide such goods involves an interference in the distribution of rewards determined by the market.

Libertarianism: an ideology that emphasizes the supremacy of the rights of individuals, especially their right to property. Libertarians typically hold that we should have the absolute minimum of government necessary and leave all other matters to the free contract of individuals.

Libertarian Socialism: a variety of non-Marxist socialism that emphasizes the freedom of the individual in a socialist society or organization.

Linguistics: the study of languages.

Means of production (in Marxist philosophy and economics): the tools and raw materials required to produce goods.

Multiculturalism: a policy of recognizing and according (limited) assistance to different cultural identities in the wider scope of Western-style liberal democracies.

Nationalism: the belief that every nation or "people" should possess its own state and that political affairs should be organized around the interests of the nation. Nationalists typically argue that citizens should take pride in their nation and have duties toward it.

Nationalization: the process of the state taking on ownership or control of an industry or resource.

Natural Law Tradition: a philosophical tradition that holds that certain "Natural Laws" exist that should govern human behavior and social organization, that these laws are given by God or are inherent in the structure of the universe, and that they are discoverable through the power of reason.

Paternalism: acting to restrict the freedom of individuals to further their interests or well being; acting on behalf of another person's "best interests."

Patriarchy (in Feminist political theory): a set of institutions in which power is overwhelmingly held and exercised by men in the interests of men.

Pluralism: the belief that many different and perhaps incomparable values exist in this world. Also, a form of society in which many different social groups coexist and share in political power.

Politics: the study of the distribution of power; who gets what, when, and how?

Queer Theory: a body of writing in political theory and cultural studies that exposes the social and historical construction of sexuality and of sexed (and gendered) bodies and identities.

Relations of production (in Marxist philosophy and economics): the social relations that govern the organization of production; the system of ownership of the **means of production**. Marx held that the relations of production determine the fundamental nature of a society. In a capitalist society, the means of production are privately owned. According to socialists, under **socialism**, they will be owned collectively by the whole society.

Secular: nonreligious. **Secularism** is the belief that religious ideas and influence should be excluded from the operation of the state. The state should not seek to promote religious ideas, nor should it justify its policies with regard to them.

Shallow ecology: the belief that we should be concerned for the flourishing of nonhuman animals and of ecosystems insofar as these relate to human interests. Such issues as global warming, the depletion of the ozone layer, pollution, and species loss are important because they threaten the welfare of human beings. Natural systems are of value insofar as they bring benefits or happiness to people rather than for their own sake. Typically a pejorative term used by those who advocate **deep ecology**.

Socialism: the belief that productive resources should be socially owned and controlled. Historically, this has usually meant state control of the economy, although alternative visions of local and democratic control do exist in the socialist tradition. Socialism is often associated with an emphasis on human *equality*, in contrast to **liberalism's** emphasis on the importance of individual freedom.

Speciesism: a term made popular by the Australian philosopher Peter Singer that is intended to convey the idea that our failure to have moral concern for the suffering of nonhuman animals is analogous to racism.

Tacit knowledge: knowledge that is not explicitly expressed or represented; knowledge of "how" to do things.

Totalitarianism: the exercise of unconstrained political power so as to order all aspects of life in a society. In totalitarian societies, such power is typically concentrated in the hands of one person or organization.

Universalism: the idea that moral principles apply universally, without reference to the particular character (for instance, the race, sex, class, nationality, and so on) of individuals. Although a familiar idea today, universalism was originally a radical notion associated with **liberalism** and one that conflicted sharply with religious (and **nationalist**) ideas about the proper organization of society.

Utilitarianism: a philosophy that holds that we should judge actions or policies according to how much pleasure they bring about (or how much suffering they cause). Its most famous expression was formulated by Jeremy Bentham, who argued that we should assess our institutions, and our laws and constitution, on the basis of what would make for the greatest happiness of the greatest number of people.

Virtue ethics: an ethical theory with origins in the thought of Aristotle that holds that we should evaluate actions according to the character traits they demonstrate in the actor. Rather than seeking to develop a *theory* of what sorts of actions are right or wrong, we should instead seek to cultivate "the virtues"—positive character traits, such as courage, wisdom, and benevolence.

Biographical Notes

Aikenhead, Thomas: Seventeenth-century Scottish student of philosophy at Edinburgh University. Executed for blasphemy.

Bentham, Jeremy: Eighteenth/nineteenth-century English philosopher and social reformer. Heralded as the founder of Utilitarianism. He argued that the morality of an act could be ascertained by referring to the Greatest Happiness Principle; that is, by calculating its impact in terms of the greatest amount of happiness of the greatest number.

Berlin, Isaiah: Twentieth-century, Latvian-born British philosopher. One of Berlin's most significant contributions to political philosophy is the distinction between negative and positive liberty. Negative liberty refers to the absence of impediment and positive liberty refers to the power to achieve an objective.

Buchanan, James: Twentieth-century American economist. Buchanan argued for a minimal state and a free market. He contended that constitutional arrangements effect economic and social development. For example, a democratic polity is prone to sacrificing gains for the wider community to vested interests.

Burke, Edmund: Eighteenth-century, Irish-born Whig politician who denounced the French Revolution as the imposition of an abstract system on a living organic community. He predicted that the revolution would end in the Terror. Burke argued that society was an organism in which diverse groups had specific functions, each of which contributed to the life of the whole.

Charles II: Stuart monarch restored after the English Civil Wars and the reign of Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector. Having no legitimate heirs, he sought the accession of his brother James the Duke of York to the throne. This move was resisted by Parliament because of James's suspected Catholic sympathies.

Engels, Friedrich: Nineteenth-century German socialist leader and political philosopher who lived in England from 1849. Collaborated on many of Marx's works, perhaps most notably *The Communist Manifesto*. He tended to emphasize the deterministic relation between economic class and social consciousness to a greater degree than Marx.

Fanon, Franz: Twentieth-century, Martinique-born French philosopher. Fanon emphasized the importance of violence in the struggle to liberate developing states from their colonial masters.

Foucault, Michel: Twentieth-century French philosopher who argued that social and individual identity was the product of power relations.

Fourier, Charles: Nineteenth-century French social reformer who devised a plan for the efficient management of society into cooperatives. His scheme was attacked and dismissed by Marx and Engels as Utopian Socialism.

Fukuyama, Francis: Twentieth-century American civil servant and professor. Argued that history has a single end point realized in liberal democracy, which is the highest form of social and political arrangement. Those states that are not liberal democracies remain developing toward this end.

Gilligan, Carol: Twentieth-century American psychologist and radical feminist who argued that women often take a different—but equally valid—approach to moral issues than do men.

Green, Thomas Hill: Nineteenth-century English philosopher whose ideas about self-development played an important role in the development of welfare liberalism.

Grimm, Jacob and Wilhelm: Nineteenth-century German philologists who studied folklore. Began the compilation of a German dictionary.

Hayek, Friedrich: Twentieth-century Austrian political philosopher who emigrated to Britain and subsequently taught in the United States. Hayek argued against central economic planning and was an important figure in the revival of interest in classical liberalism from the middle of the twentieth century.

James II: Last of the Stuart monarchs of Britain. Deposed by Parliament in the "Glorious Revolution."

Keynes, John Maynard: Twentieth-century English economist who advocated government intervention to adjust demand and maintain full employment without inflation. Keynes contributed to the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

Khomeini, The Ayatollah: Twentieth-century Iranian cleric who came to power with the overthrow of the Shah and established a fundamentalist Islamic state.

Kristol, Irving: Twentieth-century American social theorist who argued that social morality ought to be generated at a local level, such as in the family and neighborhood, leaving the state to deal with issues in high politics, such as foreign affairs.

Kuhn, Thomas S.: Twentieth-century American historian of science and philosopher, best known for his interpretation of the character of scientific revolutions.

Locke, John: Seventeenth-century English philosopher who began his career studying medicine at Oxford. Locke became family physician to the Earl of Shaftesbury and supported Shaftesbury's politics with the publication of the *Two Treatises of Government*, in which he argued for the primacy of the legislature (Parliament), as representing the will of the people, over the executive (Crown).

Lovelock, James: Twentieth-century Canadian chemist who developed the Gaia theory. Lovelock argued that the biosphere is a unified living being with moral value, but he is not against industrialization and development.

MacKinnon, Catherine: Twentieth-century American lawyer and academic who has argued for the censorship of pornography on radical feminist grounds. Pornography is understood as epitomizing the exclusion and subjection of women that is the hallmark of a patriarchal society.

Marx, Karl: Nineteenth-century German philosopher, journalist, and political economist.

Mill, James: Father of John Stuart Mill and friend and disciple of Jeremy Bentham. Mill argued that an economic style of reasoning could be extended to politics.

Mill, John Stuart: Nineteenth-century English philosopher and parliamentarian who modified Bentham's Utilitarianism. He defended individual self-development and was concerned about a possible tyranny of the majority, in which minority opinion would be silenced. Mill contended that open debate provided a necessary condition for the realization of truth. He was also a strong advocate for the political enfranchisement of women.

Millett, Kate: Twentieth-century American writer and sculptor. Millett clearly and systematically distinguished radical feminism from its liberal and socialist counterparts.

Nozick, Robert: Twentieth-century American philosopher who, in *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, explored libertarian approaches to society.

Oakeshott, Michael: Twentieth-century English philosopher who argued for a politics that seeks to accommodate changing social beliefs without imposing its own set of ideological abstractions and value judgments on society.

Plato: Ancient Greek philosopher who argued that if one knew "the good," one could not but do good. On this ground, he maintained that philosophers make the best rulers.

Putnam, Robert: Twentieth-century American social scientist who popularized the idea of social capital.

Rawls, John: Twentieth-century American philosopher whose *Theory of Justice* has had a significant influence on recent political philosophy.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques: Eighteenth-century French philosopher born in the Republic of Geneva. Rousseau held that humans were born innocent but subsequently corrupted by leisure and pride that came as the result of wealth. He proposed a political solution to humanity's alienated condition in the subscription of each to a collective general will.

Rushdie, Salman: Twentieth-century, Pakistan-born English writer. He had a *fatwah* pronounced on him because of the publication of *The Satanic Verses*, which was adjudged blasphemous by the Ayatollah Khomeini.

Sartre, Jean-Paul: Twentieth-century French philosopher, novelist, and dramatist. Sartre contributed to Existentialist philosophy by arguing that the self is the fount of all value.

Saussure, Ferdinand de: Nineteenth-century Swiss linguist. He argued for the separation of the historical from the scientific study of language.

Sen, Amartya: Twentieth-century economist and philosopher; Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; winner of the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1998.

Shaftesbury, The Earl of: Seventeenth-century Whig politician who supported the right of Parliament to exclude James II from ascending the throne of England, Scotland, and Ireland because of his Catholicism.

Sidney, Algernon: Seventeenth-century English Whig politician executed for involvement in the Rye House plot to assassinate Charles II.

Singer, Peter: Twentieth-century Australian philosopher. Bases arguments for animal welfare on utilitarian principles that moral rights are grounded in a creature's sentience rather than its rationality.

Smith, Adam: Eighteenth-century Scottish philosopher who, after beginning his career lecturing in rhetoric and moral philosophy, moved to political economy. He published *The Wealth of Nations*, in which he argued that a highly developed division of labor is the primary cause of wealth. Furthermore, the most effective motor for supplying demands is a largely self-regulating marketplace in which self-interest leads interdependent individuals to satisfy one another's wants.

Taylor, Harriet: Nineteenth-century English political and social activist. Married John Stuart Mill and encouraged him to pursue his writings and political program of liberal feminism.

Tocqueville, Alexis de: Nineteenth-century French aristocrat who published *Democracy in America*, which was based on the journals he wrote while traveling through the United States.

Weber, Max: Nineteenth/twentieth-century German economist and sociologist.

Bibliography

Ackermann, Bruce, and Alstott, Ann. *The Stakeholder Society*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000. Two Yale Law School professors advocate that each U.S. citizen with a high school diploma should receive a bounty of \$80,000 on his or her twenty-first birthday (repayable, if people have the resources, at the end of their lives), as an interpretation of ideas about equality of opportunity.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London and New York: Verso, 1991. This work offers an interesting, influential, and highly sophisticated treatment of a "subjectivist" understanding of nationalism.

Anderson, Terry, and Leal, Donald. *Free Market Environmentalism Today*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. A new book by two well-known proponents of these ideas.

Arblaster, Anthony. *The Rise and Decline of Western Liberalism*. London and New York: Blackwell, 1984. Now out of print, this book can be easily found in college libraries. It offers a challenging, radical account of the history of liberalism.

Ashcraft, Richard. *Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. London and Boston: Unwin, 1987. A readable and interesting study of Locke's thought by a leading specialist in his work.

Baird, Robert M., and Rosenbaum, Stuart E., eds. *Same Sex Marriage: The Moral and Legal Debate*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1997. An anthology, with articles for and against same-sex marriage.

Ball, Terence, and Dagger, Richard. *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal*, second edition. New York: HarperCollins, 1995. This U.S. college text is written by two knowledgeable and interesting political theorists. It is lively and readable and has pictures of some of the people discussed in this course.

———. *Ideals and Ideologies: A Reader*. New York: HarperCollins, 1991. A useful companion volume to *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal*.

Bell, Daniel P. *The End of Ideology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. First published in 1960, this book forecast the end of ideology—only to be surprised by the revival of Marxism by the New Left at the end of the decade.

Berki, R. N. *Socialism*. London: Dent, 1975. A useful introduction to socialist ideas. It is currently out of print but should be easily available in college libraries.

Berlin, Isaiah. *Karl Marx: His Life and Environment*, fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. The latest edition of a "classic" biography of Marx by a writer who is critical of Marxism.

———. *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. This book contains Berlin's "Two Concepts of Liberty," which is often referred to as a classic, and introduces the much-referred-to distinction between positive and negative liberty.

Bernstein, Richard. *Dictatorship of Virtue*. New York: Vintage, 1995. An alarmed critique of multiculturalism by a journalist who is worried by what it has meant in practical terms, for example, "political correctness."

Boaz, David, ed. *The Libertarian Reader*. New York: Free Press, 1998. A first-rate and wide-ranging companion volume to Boaz's *Primer*.

———. *Libertarianism: A Primer*. New York: Free Press, 1997. This is an excellent and readable introduction, written by the vice president of the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C.

Brownmiller, Susan. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974. Provocative study of rape as an exercise of male power over women.

Bryson, Valerie. *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction*. New York: Paragon House, 1992. A readable and wide-ranging guide to feminist political thought.

Buchanan, James, et al. *The Economics of Politics*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1978. This collection contains an introduction to "public choice" theory and to the idea that institutions should be designed on the basis of incentives.

Callinicos, Alex. *The Revenge of History*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991. This work shows how a Marxist can take a positive view of the collapse of the Soviet Union and of Soviet-dominated regimes in Eastern Europe.

———. *The Revolutionary Ideas of Karl Marx*. London: Bookmarks, 1983. This book is out of print, but it offers a lively introduction to Marx from the perspective of a Marxist activist, who is also a professor of political thought.

Coleman, James. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1994. A heavy book—in more ways than one—on social theory, including Coleman's early work on the idea of social capital.

de Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex* [1949]. New York: Vintage, 1989. This was a path-breaking work, which combined feminist analysis and philosophical reflection, by a distinguished French philosopher.

de Jasay, Anthony. *Market Socialism: A Scrutiny, "This Square Circle."* London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 1990. A brief but hard-hitting critical engagement with ideas about the feasibility of market socialism.

Devall, Bill, and Sessions, George. *Deep Ecology*. Salt Lake City, UT: G.M. Smith, 1985. An influential "classic" on deep ecology.

Dionne, E. J., Jr. *Why Americans Hate Politics*. New York: Touchstone, 1992. This selection offers an interesting introduction to how some ideas work—the author believes, destructively—in mainstream American politics today.

Dobson, Andrew. *Green Political Thought*, third edition. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. The latest edition of a guide to political environmentalism by a widely published author on these issues.

Dworkin, Andrea. *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*. New York: Dutton, 1989. A scathing criticism of pornography as depicting the abuse of women. Because Dworkin quotes and describes some gruesome material in graphic terms, this selection will not be for every reader.

Eckersley, Robyn, ed. *Markets, the State and the Environment: Towards Integration*. South Melbourne: Macmillan Education Australia, 1995. This collection includes a group of writers with environmental concerns who are not familiar with, and are, for the most part, critical of, free market environmentalist perspectives.

———. *Environmentalism and Political Theory*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992. An interesting—but not an easy—work on environmental political theory, written from the left of the political spectrum.

Elster, Jon. *An Introduction to Karl Marx*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. An introduction to Marx's work by a writer who combines criticism with a measure of sympathy for Marx's socialism.

Foldvary, Fred E. *Public Goods and Private Communities: The Market Provision of Social Services*. Aldershot, England, and Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar, 1994. Contains fascinating information about the operation of private communities.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "Feminism Is Not the Story of My Life." New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1996. An interesting example of a more conservative perspective within feminism.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Dell, 1984. Betty Friedan's work is still provocative and interesting and continues to sell very well.

Friedman, David D. *The Machinery of Freedom*, second edition. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1989. This work presents a radical, utilitarian-based approach to libertarian ideas.

Fukuyama, Frances. *Trust*. New York: Free Press, 1996. An interesting study of issues related to trust and social capital by a conservative.

———. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 1992. In this book, Fukuyama argues that liberal democracy represents the final stage in human political development.

Fussell, Paul. *Wartime: Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989. A fascinating and somewhat alarming study of the way in which people's ideas and behavior were shaped by government during the Second World War.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983. A useful source for Gellner's sociological approach to the understanding and appreciation of nationalism.

Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982. Presents Gilligan's work, which made a major impact on "difference feminism."

Goodin, Robert E., ed. *Theories of Institutional Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. This collection contains contributions (some rather difficult) by a range of scholars grappling with the problem of how best to design institutions and motivate people to work in the public interest.

Gottfried, Paul, and Fleming, Thomas. *The Conservative Movement*. Boston: Twayne, 1988. This lively account of the American conservative "movement" is written by two "insiders."

Graglia, F. Carolyn. *Domestic Tranquility: A Brief against Feminism*. Dallas: Spence, 1998. A hard-hitting critique of feminism by a conservative lawyer.

Grant, Robert. *The Politics of Sex and Other Essays: On Conservatism, Culture and Imagination*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. Essays by a contemporary writer influenced by Oakeshott.

Gray, John. *Two Faces of Liberalism*. Oxford: Polity Press, 2000. John Gray was well known as an advocate of liberalism but has become increasingly critical of liberal orthodoxies. In this, his more recent book, he offers a reinterpretation of liberalism to address the contemporary political situation.

———. *Liberalism*, second edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.

Green, Donald P., and Shapiro, Ian. *The Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996. A hard-hitting critique, by two leading political scientists, of incentives-based approaches to the understanding and design of institutions.

Halperin, David. *Saint Foucault*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997. A controversial but impassioned study of what Halperin takes to be the significance of Michel Foucault for the situation of gays and lesbians. The material is difficult, but it makes for a striking contrast with Sullivan.

Hampsher-Monk, Iain. *A History of Modern Political Thought*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992. A first-rate history of modern political thought, from which can be extracted ideas about the interplay between religious ideas and politics in a number of key thinkers.

Harrington, Michael. *The Other America*. New York: Collier, 1997. This reprint of a book first published in 1962 offers a hard-hitting look at the United States from a socialist perspective.

Haworth, Alan. *Anti-Libertarianism: Markets, Philosophy and Myth*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994. A wide-ranging critique of libertarian ideas by a British philosopher.

Hayek, Friedrich A. *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944. A "classic" exposition of the case against central economic planning.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism since 1790*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. This highly critical treatment is written from a Marxist perspective.

Holmes, Stephen. *Passions and Constraint*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995. A collection of essays dealing with a wide range of academic themes, through which Holmes also seeks to redefine liberalism.

Hunter, Michael, and Wootton, David, eds. *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1992. Includes a discussion of the execution of Aikenhead for blasphemy.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Touchstone, 1998. Another "big picture" view of the situation after the collapse of the Soviet Union, if you have a taste for such things, by a veteran writer on international relations.

Jagose, Annamarie. *Queer Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press, 1997. This selection offers a full but accessible guide to ideas about same-sex relationships, including some of the more turgid, but nonetheless challenging, recent theoretical ideas in this field.

Kedourie, Elie. *Nationalism*, third edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993. The most recent edition of an older and critical work written from a somewhat conservative perspective.

Kirk, Russell, ed. *The Portable Conservative Reader*. New York: Viking Penguin, 1982. This collection, edited by an influential American conservative, offers an anthology of conservative ideas. Kirk relates conservatism more closely to a religious perspective than does Muller.

Klein, Daniel, ed. *Reputation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997. A fascinating mixture of history and economic theory, dealing with how problems of trust have been overcome, informally, by commercial and noncommercial means.

Kymlika, Will. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. A welfare liberal approach to issues of multiculturalism by a distinguished Canadian philosopher.

———, ed. *The Rights of Minority Cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. Anthology offering a range of academic perspectives on issues relating to multiculturalism.

Larrabee M. J., ed. *An Ethic of Care*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993. Useful collection on issues raised by the work of Carol Gilligan.

Le Grand, Julian, and Estrin, Paul, eds. *Market Socialism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. An interesting collection by writers who argue for the possibility of combining socialist ideals and the price system.

Leibowitz, Stan J., and Margolis, Stephen E. *Winners, Losers and Microsoft*. Oakland: The Independent Institute, 1999. This book contains some interesting and provocative ideas about conventions and skeptical analysis of claims that we

face insuperable problems in changing them. (Compare their discussion of the QWERTY keyboard.)

Locke, John. *On Toleration*. See, for example, Locke, John, Horton, John, and Mendus, Susan. *John Locke: A Letter Concerning Toleration in Focus*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

Lopez, Mark. *The Origins of Multiculturalism in Australian Politics 1945–1975*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 2000. Detailed study of the emergence of multicultural ideas and their impact on Australian politics.

Lovelace, Linda. *Ordeal: An Autobiography*. New York: Bell, 1980. Linda Lovelace's autobiography is currently out of print but so many were sold that it is likely to be readily available. It is interesting, because it has become the object of argument between the critics and defenders of pornography.

MacKinnon, Catharine. *Only Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. A brief, hard-hitting critique of pornography by a leading academic feminist, combining analysis and emotion.

Marquand, David, and Nettler, Ronald L., eds. *Religion and Democracy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000. A recent collection of essays dealing with many aspects of the interrelationship between politics and religion in a range of different cultures.

Marx, Karl. *Selected Writings*, second edition, ed. David McLellan. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. A useful selection of Marx's writings by an academic specialist on his work.

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. *The Communist Manifesto*. This work is available in many editions. It is an interesting and readable historical document and offers a striking introduction to Marx's ideas.

McElroy, Wendy. *A Woman's Right to Pornography*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997. An interesting defense of pornography by a libertarian feminist.

McLellan, David. *The Thought of Karl Marx: An Introduction*. London: Macmillan, 1980. Currently out of print but easily obtainable in any college library, this book provides a first-rate guide through Marx's works by period and theme, from which one can get a real feel for some of his concerns.

Mead, Lawrence, M. *The New Politics of Poverty*. New York: Basic Books, 1992. This is an interesting study in itself, written from a conservative perspective. What is significant, in the context of this course, are the assumptions that the author makes about how to motivate people.

Merquior, J. G. *Liberalism Old and New*. Boston: Twayne, 1991. A historical introduction to liberalism that surveys a broad range of material and offers interesting, sometimes opinionated, comments on it.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty*. In his *On Liberty and Other Essays*, ed. John Gray. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Mill's *On Liberty* is really worth reading; not only is it an important and influential work in itself, but its arguments are still widely cited today.

———. *On the Subjection of Women*. Mill's essay is readable and available in many editions; for example, it is included in the preceding selection.

Miller, David. *On Nationality*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. A powerful defense of a moderate nationalism written from a democratic socialist perspective.

———, ed. *Liberty* (Oxford Readings in Politics and Government). London: Oxford University Press, 1991. Now, alas, out of print, but readily available in college libraries, this excellent anthology contains material that explores different approaches to the understanding of liberty.

Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2000.

Millet's book, a key text in early 1970s radical feminism, is still an interesting read; it contains much more, including literature-based discussion, than the brief presentation in this course could highlight.

Mitchell, Juliet. *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*. New York: Pantheon, 1974. An interesting exploration of whether Freudian ideas can be used in tandem with Marxism to address feminist concerns.

Muller, Jerry Z., ed. *Conservatism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997. A recent, first-rate anthology of conservative political thought, with a useful introduction.

———. *Adam Smith in His Time and Ours*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993. An interesting study of Smith's thought by a U.S. historian, which, drawing on recent scholarship, stresses some of the less-appreciated features of his work.

Naess, Arne. *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Statement of Naess's approach to ecological issues by the originator of the term "deep ecology."

Nash, George H. *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America since 1945*. Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 1996. This work surveys a wide range of conservative and classical liberal thinkers who have been important influences on modern conservative thought in the United States.

Nisbet, Robert. *Conservatism—Dream and Reality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986. An interesting introduction to conservative ideas by a distinguished U.S. sociologist. It has recently gone out of print but can be readily obtained in college libraries.

Nozick, Robert. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. New York: Basic Books, 1974. This selection explores libertarian ideas from a philosophical perspective.

Nozick—a Harvard philosophy professor—is extremely clever in his presentation and striking in his choice of examples.

Oakeshott, Michael. *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1991. Striking and exquisitely written essays by a leading twentieth-century conservative theorist.

Okin, Susan Moller, et al. *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999. Contains essays by distinguished writers, grappling with the problems posed by tensions between multiculturalism and liberal feminism.

Parekh, Bikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000. Defense of multiculturalism by a British academic political theorist and race-relations specialist.

Pipes, Daniel. *The Rushdie Affair: The Novel, the Ayatollah, and the West*. New York: Carol Publishing Group, 1990. An analysis of Rushdie's novel and the background to the Ayatollah Khomeini's judgment against it.

Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, fifth edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971. This is the latest edition of a work on political philosophy written by an Austrian-born philosopher of science and political theorist, which contains some particularly trenchant criticism of nationalism and a sympathetic yet critical treatment of Marxism.

Putnam, Robert. *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000. This book is fascinating, not only for its broad argument but also for the incredible wealth of interesting detail about social change during the twentieth century and the kind of lives that we lead now.

———. "Bowling Alone," *Journal of Democracy* 6, No. 1, January 1995, pp. 65–78. This was the journal article in which Putnam first discussed his worries about the decline of social capital in the United States. It should be readily available in college libraries and is currently offered on the Internet at the following URL: http://muse.jhu.edu/demo/journal_of_democracy/v006/putnam.html.

———. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. Putnam's study of the introduction of a new level of Italian local government, which sparked his work on social capital.

Rawls, John. *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971. Rawls is, emphatically, not a socialist, but a welfare liberal. Some of the ideas in his work, however, have also led to a reinvigoration of the territory between welfare liberalism and socialism.

Reich, Robert B. *Locked in the Cabinet*. New York: Vintage, 1998. An engaging and self-deprecating first-hand account of some of the frustrations of a man of ideas involved at the heart of recent U.S. politics.

Roemer, John E. *A Future for Socialism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994. A lively defense of socialism as feasible by a leading American socialist economist.

Rosenblum, Nancy. *Membership and Morals*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000. An interesting and wide-ranging study of a number of different kinds of associations and the roles they play in their members' lives,

including militias! The book is worth reading as a reminder of the character of some forms of associations.

Sandel, Michael. *Democracy's Discontent*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996. Sandel is not a conservative, but he is a key "communitarian" intellectual whose work illustrates, in striking ways, the manner in which certain conservative themes have recently been developed by those who would see themselves on the political left.

Schmidtz, David, and Goodin, Robert. *Social Welfare and Individual Responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. This exciting book pitches two able philosophers—a classical and a welfare liberal—against one another on the issue of responsibility for welfare.

Scruton, Roger. *The Meaning of Conservatism*. London: Macmillan, 1980. This account, by an able British philosopher, brings out some of the illiberal aspects of the conservative tradition. A second edition is about to be published.

Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books, 1999. Sen is also not a socialist, but his work on the significance of entitlements and democracy, and on the freedoms of those in both Western and developing countries, has also helped to reinvigorate the area between non-Marxist socialism and welfare liberalism as we are familiar with it in the practice of Western countries today.

Sessions, George, ed. *Deep Ecology for the Twenty-First Century*. Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, 1994. Collection of essays explaining the "deep ecology" perspective.

Shearmur, Jeremy. *Hayek and After*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Discussion of the distinctive version of classical liberalism developed by Friedrich Hayek and of what might be needed to develop these ideas further.

———. *The Political Thought of Karl Popper*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Takes further some of the ideas of the author of this course, by way of a critical discussion of the political thought of the philosopher Karl Popper.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*, revised edition. Avon/Hearst Corporation, 1991. This work combines utilitarian philosophy and details of how animals are treated to present a case that animals should be treated very differently and to argue in favor of vegetarianism.

Smith, Anthony. *Nationalism and Modernism*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. This recent work by a specialist offers a broad account of different theories of nationalism.

Sommers, Christine. *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994. A defense of liberal feminism, in broadly the tradition of J. S. Mill against radical feminism.

Steele, David Ramsay. *From Marx to Mises*. La Salle, IL: Open Court, 1992. A striking presentation of the "Austrian" critique of socialism.

Strossen, Nadine. *In Defense of Pornography*. New York: New York University Press, 2000. Defense of pornography on free-speech grounds by an academic lawyer and president of the ACLU.

Sullivan, Andrew, ed. *Same Sex Marriage: Pro and Con—A Reader*. New York: Vintage, 1997. A useful anthology, with articles for and against same-sex marriage.

———. *Virtually Normal*. New York: Vintage, 1996. A challenging book by a writer whose broad views are conservative or classical liberal, in favor of gay marriage. He engages with religious-based objections to his views.

Tamir, Yael. *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993. This is a defense of nationalism and, in particular, an argument about its compatibility with (welfare) liberalism.

Tawney, Richard Henry. *Equality*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1931. A powerful study by an influential British socialist who was inspired by Christian ideals. It went through many editions and will be available in college libraries or used bookstores.

Taylor, Charles, and Gutmann, Amy, eds. *Multiculturalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. An interesting collection on multiculturalism, centered on an essay by the Canadian philosopher Charles Taylor. Gutmann's introduction to the volume is especially recommended.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. For example, tr. George Lawrence, ed. J. P. Mayer, London: Fontana, 1994. See, especially, Part 1, chapters 4 and 6; Part 2 chapters 1–8.

Vincent, Andrew. *Political Ideologies*, second edition. London and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1995. This study is more advanced than Ball and Dagger's; it is challenging and reflective but may take for granted ideas with which readers who are first approaching this course are not familiar.

Waldron, Jeremy. *Liberal Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. A striking collection of papers on themes relating to liberalism by that rare phenomenon, an academic who can deal with difficult and important issues yet write lucidly.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* [1792]. This powerful early feminist work is available in many editions; for example, Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, ed. Ashley Taichert, London: Everyman Paperbacks, 1995.

Wright, Anthony. *Socialisms: Theories and Practises*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1986. A survey of various interpretations of socialism by a British writer who has considerable sympathy for socialist ideals.

Zimmerman, Michael E., ed. *Environmental Philosophy: From Animal Rights to Radical Ecology*. Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997. This useful anthology contains contributions that discuss a whole range of approaches to environmental issues.